

NOT VOTING—7

Adams
Boyle, Brendan
F.

Forbes
Jackson Lee
Kaptur

McMorris
Rodgers
Roe (TN)

□ 1340

Messrs. FARENTHOLD, HANNA, McCLINTOCK, and WEBSTER of Florida changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPRO- PRIATIONS ACT, 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLEISCHMANN). Pursuant to House Resolution 287 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2578.

Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK) kindly take the chair.

□ 1342

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2578) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, with Mr. LOUDERMILK (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT) had been disposed of, and the bill had been read through page 98, line 20.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment by Mr. PITTENGER of North Carolina.

Amendment by Mr. NADLER of New York.

Amendment by Mr. FARR of California.

Amendment No. 1 by Mrs. BLACKBURN of Tennessee.

Amendment by Mr. FOSTER of Illinois.

Amendment No. 9 by Ms. BONAMICI of Oregon.

Amendment by Mr. ELLISON of Minnesota.

Amendment by Mr. GRAYSON of Florida.

Amendment by Mr. ROHRABACHER of California.

Amendment by Mr. GRAYSON of Florida.

Amendment by Mr. McCLINTOCK of California.

Amendment by Mr. PERRY of Pennsylvania.

Amendment by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PITTENGER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PITTENGER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 163, noes 263, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 275]

AYES—163

Allen	Grothman	Pearce
Amash	Hardy	Perry
Amodei	Harris	Pittenger
Babin	Hartzler	Pitts
Barietta	Hensarling	Pompeo
Barr	Hice, Jody B.	Posey
Benish	Hill	Price, Tom
Billakis	Holding	Ratcliffe
Bishop (UT)	Hudson	Reed
Black	Huelskamp	Ribble
Blackburn	Huizenga (MI)	Rice (SC)
Brady (TX)	Hultgren	Roby
Brat	Hunter	Rogers (AL)
Bridenstine	Hurd (TX)	Rohrabacher
Brooks (AL)	Hurt (VA)	Rokita
Brooks (IN)	Issa	Roskam
Bucshon	Jenkins (KS)	Rothfus
Burgess	Johnson (OH)	Rouzer
Byrne	Johnson, Sam	Russell
Carter (GA)	Jordan	Ryan (WI)
Carter (TX)	Kelly (PA)	Salmon
Chabot	King (IA)	Sanford
Chaffetz	King (NY)	Scalise
Clawson (FL)	Kinzing (IL)	Schweikert
Coffman	Kirkpatrick	Scott, Austin
Collins (GA)	Kline	Sensenbrenner
Collins (NY)	Knight	Sessions
Comstock	Labrador	Shuster
Conaway	LaMalfa	Sinema
Cook	Lamborn	Smith (NE)
Cramer	Latta	Smith (TX)
Crawford	LoBiondo	Stewart
Curbelo (FL)	Loudermilk	Stutzman
Dent	Love	Thornberry
DeSantis	Luetkemeyer	Tipton
DesJarlais	Marchant	Walberg
Duffy	Marino	Walorski
Duncan (SC)	McCarthy	Walters, Mimi
Fincher	McCauley	Weber (TX)
Fleming	McHenry	Wenstrup
Flores	Meadows	Westerman
Forbes	Messer	Whitfield
Fortenberry	Mica	Williams
Fox	Miller (FL)	Wilson (SC)
Franks (AZ)	Miller (MI)	Wittman
Garrett	Mooney (WV)	Womack
Gibbs	Mullin	Woodall
Goodlatte	Mulvaney	Yoder
Gosar	Neugebauer	Yoho
Gowdy	Newhouse	Young (IN)
Graham	Nunes	Zeldin
Granger	Olson	Zinke
Graves (GA)	Palazzo	
Graves (LA)	Palmer	
Graves (MO)	Paulsen	

NOES—263

Abraham	Gallego	Nolan
Aderholt	Garamendi	Norcross
Aguilar	Gibson	Nugent
Ashford	Gohmert	O'Rourke
Barton	Grayson	Pallone
Bass	Green, Al	Pascarella
Beatty	Green, Gene	Payne
Becerra	Griffith	Pelosi
Bera	Grijalva	Perlmutter
Beyer	Guinta	Peters
Bishop (GA)	Guthrie	Peterson
Bishop (MI)	Gutierrez	Pingree
Blum	Hahn	Pocan
Blumenauer	Hanna	Poe (TX)
Bonamici	Harper	Poliquin
Bost	Hastings	Polis
Boustany	Heck (NV)	Price (NC)
Brady (PA)	Heck (WA)	Quigley
Brown (FL)	Herrera Beutler	Rangel
Brownley (CA)	Higgins	Reichert
Buchanan	Himes	Renacci
Buck	Hinojosa	Rice (NY)
Bustos	Honda	Richmond
Butterfield	Hoyer	Rigell
Calvert	Huffman	Rogers (KY)
Capps	Israel	Rooney (FL)
Capuano	Jeffries	Ros-Lehtinen
Cárdenas	Jenkins (WV)	Ross
Carney	Johnson (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Carson (IN)	Johnson, E. B.	Royce
Cartwright	Jolly	Ruiz
Castor (FL)	Jones	Ruppersberger
Castro (TX)	Joyce	Rush
Chu, Judy	Katko	Ryan (OH)
Ciulline	Keating	Sánchez, Linda
Clark (MA)	Kelly (IL)	T.
Clarke (NY)	Kennedy	Sanchez, Loretta
Clay	Kildee	Sarbanes
Cleaver	Kilmer	Schakowsky
Clyburn	Kind	Schiff
Cohen	Kuster	Schrader
Cole	Lance	Scott (VA)
Connolly	Langevin	Scott, David
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Serrano
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Sewell (AL)
Costa	Lawrence	Sherman
Costello (PA)	Lee	Shimkus
Courtney	Levin	Simpson
Crenshaw	Lewis	Sires
Crowley	Lieu, Ted	Slaughter
Cuellar	Lipinski	Smith (NJ)
Culberson	Loeback	Smith (WA)
Cummings	Lofgren	Speier
Davis (CA)	Long	Stefanik
Davis, Danny	Lowenthal	Stivers
Davis, Rodney	Lowey	Swalwell (CA)
DeFazio	Lucas	Takai
DeGette	Lujan Grisham	Takano
Delaney	(NM)	Thompson (CA)
DeLauro	Lujan, Ben Ray	Thompson (MS)
DelBene	(NM)	Thompson (PA)
Denham	Lummis	Tiberi
DeSaulnier	Lynch	Titus
Deutch	MacArthur	Tonko
Diaz-Balart	Maloney,	Torres
Dingell	Carolyn	Trott
Doggett	Maloney, Sean	Tsongas
Dold	Massie	Turner
Donovan	Matsui	Upton
Doyle, Michael	McClintock	Valadao
F.	McCormack	Van Hollen
Duckworth	McDermott	Vargas
Duncan (TN)	McGovern	Veasey
Edwards	McKinley	Vela
Ellison	McMorris	Velázquez
Ellmers (NC)	Rodgers	Visclosky
Emmer (MN)	McNerney	Wagner
Engel	McSally	Walden
Eshoo	Meehan	Walker
Esty	Meeks	Walz
Farenthold	Meng	Wasserman
Farr	Moolenaar	Schultz
Fattah	Moore	Waters, Maxine
Fitzpatrick	Moulton	Watson Coleman
Fleischmann	Murphy (FL)	Webster (FL)
Foster	Murphy (PA)	Welch
Frankel (FL)	Nadler	Wilson (FL)
Frelinghuysen	Napolitano	Yarmuth
Fudge	Neal	Young (AK)
Gabbard	Noem	Young (IA)

NOT VOTING—6

Adams	Jackson Lee	Smith (MO)
Boyle, Brendan	Kaptur	
F.	Roe (TN)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1347

Ms. MOORE changed her vote from
“aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from New York (Mr. NAD-
LER) on which further proceedings were
postponed and on which the noes pre-
vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 170, noes 256,
not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 276]

AYES—170

Amash	Foster	Moore
Bass	Frankel (FL)	Moulton
Beatty	Fudge	Nadler
Becerra	Gabbard	Napolitano
Bera	Galleo	Neal
Beyer	Garamendi	Nolan
Bishop (GA)	Gibson	Norcross
Blumenauer	Grayson	O'Rourke
Bonamici	Green, Al	Pallone
Brady (PA)	Grijalva	Pascarell
Brown (FL)	Hahn	Payne
Bustos	Hastings	Pelosi
Butterfield	Heck (WA)	Perlmutter
Capuano	Higgins	Peters
Cardenas	Himes	Peterson
Carney	Hinojosa	Pingree
Carson (IN)	Honda	Pocan
Cartwright	Hoyer	Polis
Castor (FL)	Huffman	Price (NC)
Castro (TX)	Israel	Quigley
Chu, Judy	Jeffries	Rangel
Cicilline	Johnson (GA)	Rice (NY)
Clark (MA)	Johnson, E. B.	Rice (SC)
Clarke (NY)	Keating	Richmond
Clay	Kelly (IL)	Roybal-Allard
Cleaver	Kennedy	Rush
Clyburn	Kildee	Ryan (OH)
Cohen	Kilmer	Sánchez, Linda
Connolly	Kind	T.
Conyers	Kuster	Sanford
Cooper	Langevin	Sarbanes
Courtney	Larsen (WA)	Schakowsky
Crowley	Larson (CT)	Schiff
Cummings	Lawrence	Schrader
Davis (CA)	Lee	Scott (VA)
Davis, Danny	Levin	Scott, David
DeFazio	Lewis	Serrano
DeGette	Lieu, Ted	Sewell (AL)
Delaney	Loebach	Sherman
DeLauro	Lofgren	Slaughter
DelBene	Lowenthal	Smith (WA)
DeSaulnier	Lowe	Speier
Deutch	Lujan Grisham	Swalwell (CA)
Dingell	(NM)	Takai
Doggett	Luján, Ben Ray	Takano
Doyle, Michael	(NM)	Thompson (CA)
F.	Lynch	Thompson (MS)
Duckworth	Maloney,	Titus
Duncan (TN)	Carolyn	Tonko
Edwards	Matsui	Torres
Ellison	McCollum	Tsongas
Engel	McDermott	Van Hollen
Eshoo	McGovern	Vargas
Esty	McNerney	Veasey
Farr	Meeks	Velázquez
Fattah	Meng	Visclosky

Walz
Wasserman
SchultzWaters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
WelchWilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—256

Abraham	Green, Gene
Aderholt	Griffith
Aguilar	Grothman
Allen	Guinta
Amodei	Guthrie
Ashford	Hanna
Babin	Hardy
Barletta	Harper
Barr	Harris
Barton	Hartzler
Benishok	Heck (NV)
Bilirakis	Hensarling
Bishop (MI)	Herrera Beutler
Bishop (UT)	Hice, Jody B.
Black	Hill
Blackburn	Holding
Blum	Hudson
Bost	Huelskamp
Boustany	Huizenga (MI)
Brady (TX)	Hultgren
Brat	Hunter
Bridenstine	Hurd (TX)
Brooks (AL)	Hurt (VA)
Brooks (IN)	Issa
Brownley (CA)	Jenkins (KS)
Buchanan	Jenkins (WV)
Buck	Johnson (OH)
Bucshon	Johnson, Sam
Burgess	Jolly
Byrne	Ruiz
Calvert	Jones
Capps	Jordan
Carter (GA)	Joyce
Carter (TX)	Katko
Chabot	Kelly (PA)
Chaffetz	King (IA)
Clawson (FL)	King (NY)
Coffman	Kinzinger (IL)
Cole	Kirkpatrick
Collins (GA)	Kline
Collins (NY)	Knight
Comstock	Labrador
Conaway	LaMalfa
Cook	Lamborn
Costa	Lance
Costello (PA)	Latta
Cramer	Lipinski
Crawford	LoBiondo
Crenshaw	Long
Cuellar	Loudermilk
Culberson	Love
Curbelo (FL)	Lucas
Davis, Rodney	Luetkemeyer
Denham	Lummis
Dent	MacArthur
DeSantis	Maloney, Sean
DesJarlais	Marchant
Diaz-Balart	Marino
Dold	Massie
Donovan	McCarthy
Duffy	McCaull
Duncan (SC)	McClintock
Ellmers (NC)	McHenry
Emmer (MN)	McKinley
Farenthold	McMorris
Fincher	Rodgers
Fitzpatrick	McSally
Fleischmann	Meadows
Fleming	Meehan
Flores	Messer
Forbes	Mica
Fortenberry	Miller (FL)
Fox	Miller (MI)
Franks (AZ)	Moolenaar
Frelinghuysen	Mooney (WV)
Garrett	Mullin
Gibbs	Mulvaney
Gohmert	Murphy (FL)
Goodlatte	Murphy (PA)
Gosar	Neugebauer
Gowdy	Newhouse
Graham	Noem
Granger	Nugent
Graves (GA)	Nunes
Graves (LA)	Olson
Graves (MO)	Palazzo
	Palmer

NOT VOTING—6

Adams
Boyle, Brendan
F.Gutiérrez
Jackson Lee
Kaptur

Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

Roe (TN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1351

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chair, on rollcall Vote No.
276 I am recorded as voting “no;” however, I
intended to vote “yes.”

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Chair, I was inadver-
tently absent in the House chamber for a vote
on Wednesday, June 3, 2015. Had I been
present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall
vote 276 in support of the Nadler Amendment
to remove language in the underlying bill to
prohibit the use of funds to transfer or release
detainees held at Guantanamo Bay.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FARR

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from California (Mr. FARR)
on which further proceedings were
postponed and on which the noes pre-
vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 153, noes 273,
not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 277]

AYES—153

Aguilar	Doyle, Michael	Lowenthal
Bass	F.	Lowey
Beatty	Duckworth	Lujan Grisham
Becerra	Edwards	(NM)
Beyer	Ellison	Luján, Ben Ray
Bishop (GA)	Eshoo	(NM)
Blumenauer	Esty	Maloney,
Bonamici	Farr	Carolyn
Brady (PA)	Fattah	Matsui
Bustos	Foster	McCollum
Butterfield	Fudge	McDermott
Capps	Gabbard	McGovern
Capuano	Galleo	McNerney
Carney	Garamendi	Meeks
Carson (IN)	Green, Al	Meng
Cartwright	Grijalva	Moore
Castor (FL)	Gutiérrez	Moulton
Castro (TX)	Hahn	Nadler
Chu, Judy	Higgins	Napolitano
Cicilline	Himes	Neal
Clark (MA)	Hinojosa	Nolan
Clarke (NY)	Honda	O'Rourke
Clay	Huffman	Payne
Cleaver	Israel	Pelosi
Clyburn	Jeffries	Perlmutter
Cohen	Johnson (GA)	Peters
Conyers	Johnson, E. B.	Peterson
Cooper	Kelly (IL)	Pingree
Costa	Kennedy	Pocan
Courtney	Kildee	Polis
Cramer	Kilmer	Price (NC)
Crowley	Kind	Rangel
Cummings	Kirkpatrick	Rice (NY)
Davis (CA)	Langevin	Richmond
Davis, Danny	Larsen (WA)	Roybal-Allard
DeFazio	Larson (CT)	Ruiz
DeGette	Lawrence	Rush
Delaney	Lee	Ryan (OH)
DeLauro	Levin	Sánchez, Linda
DelBene	Lewis	T.
DeSaulnier	Lieu, Ted	Sanchez, Loretta
Dingell	Loebach	Sarbanes
Doggett	Lofgren	Schakowsky

Schiff
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier

NOES—273

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bera
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Cárdenas
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Costello (PA)
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy

Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen

Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Welch
Yarmuth

Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman

Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—6

Adams
Boyle, Brendan F.

Grayson
Jackson Lee
Kaptur

Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)

Smith (TX)
Stewart
Stutzman
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)

Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zinke

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1355

Mr. CICILLINE changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 168, noes 257, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 278]

AYES—168

Allen
Amash
Babin
Barton
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cramer
Crawford
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Engel
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxy
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)

Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Harper
Harris
Hartzel
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Long
Loudermilk

Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Massie
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rothfus
Rouzer

Abraham
Aderholt
Aguilar
Amodei
Ashford
Barletta
Barr
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Ciocile
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Comstock
Connolly
Conyers
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick

NOES—257

Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Granger
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildeer
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebach
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)

Nadler
Neal
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascarella
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz

Wasserman	Webster (FL)	Womack
Schultz	Welch	Yarmuth
Waters, Maxine	Westmoreland	Young (AK)
Watson Coleman	Whitfield	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—7

Adams	Carson (IN)	Roe (TN)
Boyle, Brendan F.	Hinojosa	Wilson (FL)
	Jackson Lee	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1358

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 278, had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FOSTER

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. WOODALL).
The unfinished business is the demand
for a recorded vote on the amendment
offered by the gentleman from Illinois
(Mr. FOSTER) on which further pro-
ceedings were postponed and on which
the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 195, noes 232,
not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 279]

AYES—195

Aguilar	Dingell	Jeffries
Amash	Doggett	Johnson, E. B.
Barletta	Dold	Jones
Bass	Doyle, Michael F.	Kaptur
Becerra		Katko
Benishek	Duckworth	Kelly (IL)
Bera	Duffy	Kildee
Beyer	Duncan (TN)	Kind
Bilirakis	Edwards	Kinzing (IL)
Bishop (MI)	Ellison	Kirkpatrick
Bishop (UT)	Emmer (MN)	Kline
Bost	Engel	LaMalfa
Brat	Fitzpatrick	Lance
Brownley (CA)	Forbes	Larsen (WA)
Bucshon	Foster	Latta
Burgess	Foxx	Lawrence
Bustos	Franks (AZ)	Levin
Cárdenas	Gallego	Lieu, Ted
Carson (IN)	Garamendi	Lipinski
Carter (GA)	Garrett	LoBiondo
Cartwright	Gibbs	Loeb sack
Castro (TX)	Gohmert	Loudermilk
Chabot	Goodlatte	Lowenthal
Chu, Judy	Graham	Maloney,
Clawson (FL)	Graves (GA)	Carolyn
Clay	Griffith	Maloney, Sean
Coffman	Grothman	Massie
Collins (GA)	Gutiérrez	McCarthy
Connolly	Harris	McClintock
Cooper	Hensarling	McCollum
Costa	Herrera Beutler	McDermott
Costello (PA)	Hice, Jody B.	McHenry
Crowley	Higgins	McMorris
Cuellar	Himes	Rodgers
Cummings	Holding	McNerney
Davis (CA)	Hoyer	McSally
Davis, Rodney	Hudson	Meeks
DeGette	Huffman	Meng
Delaney	Huizenga (MI)	Miller (FL)
Denham	Hultgren	Miller (MI)
Dent	Hunter	Moore
DeSantis	Hurt (VA)	Murphy (FL)
DesJarlais	Issa	Murphy (PA)

Nadler	Ribble	Sires
Napolitano	Rice (NY)	Smith (NJ)
Nolan	Rohrabacher	Smith (WA)
Norcross	Roskam	Stivers
Nugent	Ross	Takano
O'Rourke	Rothfus	Tiberi
Pallone	Rouzer	Torres
Pascarell	Roybal-Allard	Upton
Paulsen	Ruiz	Vargas
Payne	Ruppersberger	Veasey
Pelosi	Ryan (WI)	Vela
Perlmutter	Salmon	Wagner
Perry	Sánchez, Linda T.	Walberg
Peters	Sanchez, Loretta	Walden
Peterson	Sarbanes	Walz
Pittenger	Schakowsky	Wasserman
Pocan	Schweikert	Schultz
Poe (TX)	Scott, Austin	Waters, Maxine
Polis	Sensenbrenner	Webster (FL)
Price, Tom	Sherman	Wenstrup
Quigley	Shimkus	Wilson (FL)
Rangel	Shuster	Woodall
Ratcliffe	Sinema	Yoho
Renacci		

NOES—232

Abraham	Gabbard	Mooney (WV)
Aderholt	Gibson	Moulton
Allen	Gosar	Mullin
Amodei	Gowdy	Mulvaney
Ashford	Granger	Neal
Barr	Graves (LA)	Neugebauer
Barton	Graves (MO)	Newhouse
Beatty	Grayson	Noem
Bishop (GA)	Green, Al	Nunes
Black	Green, Gene	Olson
Blackburn	Grijalva	Palazzo
Blum	Guinta	Palmer
Blumenauer	Guthrie	Pearce
Bonamici	Hahn	Pingree
Boustany	Hanna	Pitts
Brady (PA)	Hardy	Poliquin
Brady (TX)	Harper	Pompeo
Bridenstine	Hartzler	Posey
Brooks (AL)	Hastings	Price (NC)
Brooks (IN)	Heck (NV)	Reed
Brown (FL)	Heck (WA)	Reichert
Buchanan	Hill	Rice (SC)
Buck	Hinojosa	Richmond
Butterfield	Honda	Rigell
Byrne	Huelskamp	Roby
Calvert	Hurd (TX)	Rogers (AL)
Capps	Israel	Rogers (KY)
Capuano	Jenkins (KS)	Rokita
Carney	Jenkins (WV)	Rooney (FL)
Carter (TX)	Johnson (GA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Castor (FL)	Johnson (OH)	Royce
Chaffetz	Johnson, Sam	Rush
Cicilline	Jolly	Russell
Clark (MA)	Jordan	Ryan (OH)
Clarke (NY)	Joyce	Sanford
Cleaver	Keating	Scalise
Clyburn	Kelly (PA)	Schiff
Cohen	Kennedy	Schrader
Cole	Kilmer	Scott (VA)
Collins (NY)	King (IA)	Scott, David
Comstock	King (NY)	Serrano
Conaway	Knight	Sessions
Conyers	Kuster	Sewell (AL)
Cook	Labrador	Simpson
Courtney	Lamborn	Slaughter
Cramer	Langevin	Smith (MO)
Crawford	Larson (CT)	Smith (NE)
Crenshaw	Lee	Smith (TX)
Culberson	Lewis	Speier
Curbelo (FL)	Lofgren	Stefanik
Davis, Danny	Long	Stewart
DeFazio	Love	Stutzman
DeLauro	Lowey	Swalwell (CA)
DelBene	Lucas	Takai
DeSaulnier	Luetkemeyer	Thompson (CA)
Deutch	Lujan Grisham	Thompson (MS)
Diaz-Balart	(NM)	Thompson (PA)
Donovan	Luján, Ben Ray	Thornberry
Duncan (SC)	(NM)	Tipton
Ellmers (NC)	Lummis	Titus
Eshoo	Lynch	Tonko
Esty	MacArthur	Trott
Farenthold	Marchant	Tsongas
Farr	Marino	Turner
Fattah	Matsui	Valadao
Fincher	McCauley	Van Hollen
Fleischmann	McGovern	Velázquez
Fleming	McKinley	Visclosky
Flores	Meadows	Walker
Fortenberry	Meehan	Walorski
Frankel (FL)	Messer	Walters, Mimi
Frelinghuysen	Mica	Watson Coleman
Fudge	Moolenaar	Weber (TX)

Welch	Wilson (SC)	Young (AK)
Westerman	Wittman	Young (IA)
Westmoreland	Womack	Young (IN)
Whitfield	Yarmuth	Zeldin
Williams	Yoder	Zinke

NOT VOTING—5

Adams	Boyle, Brendan F.	Jackson Lee
Babin		Roe (TN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1403

Messrs. NORCROSS, SIRES, and
CUMMINGS changed their vote from
“no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MS. BONAMICI

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms.
BONAMICI) on which further proceedings
were postponed and on which the noes
prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 282, noes 146,
not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 280]

AYES—282

Aguilar	Collins (NY)	Fleischmann
Amash	Comstock	Fortenberry
Ashford	Conaway	Foster
Barr	Connolly	Frankel (FL)
Bass	Conyers	Fudge
Becerra	Cooper	Gabbard
Benishek	Costa	Gallego
Bera	Costello (PA)	Garamendi
Beyer	Courtney	Garrett
Bishop (GA)	Cramer	Gibson
Bishop (UT)	Crowley	Goodlatte
Blackburn	Cummings	Graham
Blum	Curbelo (FL)	Graves (GA)
Blumenauer	Davis (CA)	Grayson
Bonamici	Davis, Danny	Green, Al
Brady (PA)	Davis, Rodney	Green, Gene
Brat	DeFazio	Griffith
Brooks (AL)	DeGette	Grijalva
Brooks (IN)	Delaney	Grothman
Brown (FL)	DeLauro	Gutiérrez
Brownley (CA)	DelBene	Hahn
Buck	Dent	Hanna
Bucshon	DeSantis	Hardy
Bustos	DeSaulnier	Hastings
Butterfield	DesJarlais	Heck (NV)
Capps	Deutch	Heck (WA)
Capuano	Dingell	Herrera Beutler
Cárdenas	Doggett	Hice, Jody B.
Carney	Dold	Higgins
Carson (IN)	Donovan	Himes
Cartwright	Doyle, Michael F.	Honda
Castor (FL)		Hoyer
Castro (TX)	Duckworth	Huelskamp
Chaffetz	Duncan (SC)	Huffman
Chu, Judy	Duncan (TN)	Hunter
Cicilline	Edwards	Hurt (VA)
Clark (MA)	Ellison	Israel
Clarke (NY)	Ellmers (NC)	Jeffries
Clawson (FL)	Emmer (MN)	Jenkins (KS)
Clay	Engel	Jenkins (WV)
Cleaver	Eshoo	Johnson (GA)
Clyburn	Esty	Johnson, E. B.
Coffman	Farr	Jolly
Cohen	Fattah	Jones
Collins (GA)	Fincher	Joyce

Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowe
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyne
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mooney (WV)

Moore
Moulton
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Poliquin
Polis
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schweikert

Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—146

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barton
Beatty
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Black
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Buchanan
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cole
Cook
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Denham
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)

Guinta
Guthrie
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Hill
Hinojosa
Holding
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurd (TX)
Issa
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Long
Lucas
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy
McCaul
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem

Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reichert
Renacci
Robby
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stivers
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Trott
Turner
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walker

Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)

Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)

Wittman
Womack
Yoder

NOT VOTING—4

Adams
Boyle, Brendan F.
Jackson Lee
Roe (TN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. LOUDERMILK) (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1407

Mr. REED changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ELLISON

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 184, noes 244, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 281]

AYES—184

Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch

Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster

Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyne
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis

Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader

Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres

Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishke
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)

Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes

Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder

NOES—244

Yoho Young (IA) Zeldin
Young (AK) Young (IN) Zinke

NOT VOTING—4

Adams Boyle, Brendan Jackson Lee
F. Roe (TN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1413

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 27, noes 399, answered “present” 1, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 282]

AYES—27

Aderholt	Grayson	Perry
Brooks (AL)	Issa	Posey
Burgess	Jones	Rohrabacher
Carson (IN)	Katko	Russell
Duncan (TN)	LaMalfa	Sensenbrenner
Fincher	Lofgren	Takai
Gabbard	McKinley	Titus
Gibson	Mooney (WV)	Visclosky
Gohmert	Nolan	Yoho

NOES—399

Abraham	Buchanan	Cook
Aguilar	Buck	Cooper
Allen	Bucshon	Costa
Amash	Bustos	Costello (PA)
Amodei	Butterfield	Courtney
Ashford	Byrne	Cramer
Babin	Calvert	Crawford
Barletta	Capps	Crenshaw
Barr	Capuano	Crowley
Barton	Cárdenas	Cuellar
Bass	Carney	Culberson
Beatty	Carter (GA)	Cummings
Becerra	Carter (TX)	Curbelo (FL)
Benishek	Cartwright	Davis (CA)
Bera	Castor (FL)	Davis, Danny
Beyer	Castro (TX)	Davis, Rodney
Billirakis	Chabot	DeGette
Bishop (GA)	Chaffetz	Delaney
Bishop (MI)	Chu, Judy	DeLauro
Bishop (UT)	Cicilline	DelBene
Black	Clark (MA)	Denham
Blackburn	Clarke (NY)	Dent
Blum	Clawson (FL)	DeSantis
Blumenauer	Clay	DeSaulnier
Bonamici	Cleaver	DesJarlais
Bost	Clyburn	Deutch
Boustany	Coffman	Diaz-Balart
Brady (PA)	Cohen	Dingell
Brady (TX)	Cole	Doggett
Brat	Collins (GA)	Dold
Bridenstine	Collins (NY)	Donovan
Brooks (IN)	Comstock	Doyle, Michael
Brown (FL)	Conaway	F.
Brownley (CA)	Connolly	Duckworth

Duffy	Lance	Rice (NY)
Duncan (SC)	Langevin	Rice (SC)
Edwards	Larsen (WA)	Richmond
Ellison	Larson (CT)	Rigell
Ellmers (NC)	Latta	Roby
Emmer (MN)	Lawrence	Rogers (AL)
Engel	Lee	Rogers (KY)
Eshoo	Levin	Rokita
Esty	Lewis	Rooney (FL)
Farenthold	Lieu, Ted	Ros-Lehtinen
Farr	Lipinski	Roskam
Fattah	LoBiondo	Ross
Fitzpatrick	Loeb sack	Rothfus
Fleischmann	Long	Rouzer
Fleming	Loudermillk	Roybal-Allard
Flores	Love	Royce
Forbes	Lowenthal	Ruiz
Fortenberry	Lowe	Ruppersberger
Foster	Lucas	Rush
Fox	Luetkemeyer	Ryan (OH)
Frankel (FL)	Lujan Grisham	Ryan (WI)
Franks (AZ)	(NM)	Salmon
Frelinghuysen	Luján, Ben Ray	Sánchez, Linda
Fudge	(NM)	T.
Gallego	Lummi	Sanchez, Loretta
Garamendi	Lynch	Sanford
Garrett	MacArthur	Sarbanes
Gibbs	Maloney,	Scalise
Goodlatte	Carolyn	Schakowsky
Gosar	Maloney, Sean	Schiff
Gowdy	Marchant	Schrader
Graham	Marino	Schweikert
Granger	Massie	Scott (VA)
Graves (GA)	Matsui	Scott, Austin
Graves (LA)	McCarthy	Scott, David
Graves (MO)	McCaul	Serrano
Green, Al	McClintock	Sessions
Green, Gene	McCollum	Sewell (AL)
Griffith	McDermott	Sherman
Grijalva	McGovern	Shimkus
Grothman	McHenry	Shuster
Guinta	McMorris	Simpson
Guthrie	Rodgers	Sinema
Gutiérrez	McNerney	Sires
Hahn	McSally	Slaughter
Hanna	Meadows	Smith (MO)
Hardy	Meehan	Smith (NE)
Harper	Meeks	Smith (NJ)
Harris	Meng	Smith (TX)
Hartzler	Messer	Smith (WA)
Hastings	Mica	Speier
Heck (NV)	Miller (FL)	Stefanik
Heck (WA)	Miller (MI)	Stewart
Hensarling	Moolenaar	Stivers
Herrera Beutler	Moore	Stutzman
Hice, Jody B.	Moulton	Swalwell (CA)
Higgins	Mullin	Takano
Hill	Mulvaney	Thompson (CA)
Himes	Murphy (FL)	Thompson (MS)
Hinojosa	Murphy (PA)	Thompson (PA)
Holding	Nadler	Thornberry
Honda	Napolitano	Tiberi
Hoyer	Neal	Tipton
Hudson	Neugebauer	Tonko
Huelskamp	Newhouse	Torres
Huffman	Noem	Trott
Huizenga (MI)	Norcross	Tsongas
Hultgren	Nugent	Turner
Hunter	Nunes	Upton
Hurd (TX)	O'Rourke	Valadao
Hurt (VA)	Olson	Van Hollen
Israel	Palazzo	Vargas
Jeffries	Pallone	Veasey
Jenkins (KS)	Palmer	Vela
Jenkins (WV)	Pascrell	Velázquez
Johnson (GA)	Paulsen	Wagner
Johnson (OH)	Payne	Walberg
Johnson, E. B.	Pearce	Walden
Johnson, Sam	Pelosi	Walker
Jolly	Perlmutter	Walorski
Jordan	Peters	Walters, Mimi
Joyce	Peterson	Walz
Kaptur	Pingree	Wasserman
Keating	Pittenger	Schultz
Kelly (IL)	Pitts	Waters, Maxine
Kelly (PA)	Pocan	Watson Coleman
Kennedy	Poe (TX)	Weber (TX)
Kildee	Poliquin	Webster (FL)
Kilmer	Polis	Welch
Kind	Pompeo	Wenstrup
King (IA)	Price (NC)	Westerman
King (NY)	Price, Tom	Westmoreland
Kinzinger (IL)	Quigley	Whitfield
Kirkpatrick	Rangel	Williams
Kline	Ratcliffe	Wilson (FL)
Knight	Reed	Wilson (SC)
Kuster	Reichert	Wittman
Labrador	Renacci	Womack
Lamborn	Ribble	Woodall

Yarmuth Young (IA) Zinke
Yoder Young (IN)
Young (AK) Zeldin

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

DeFazio

NOT VOTING—5

Adams Boyle, Brendan Conyers
F. Jackson Lee
Roe (TN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1416

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California changed her vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROHRABACHER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 242, noes 186, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 283]

AYES—242

Aguilar	Cramer	Grayson
Amash	Crowley	Green, Al
Ashford	Cummings	Green, Gene
Beatty	Curbelo (FL)	Grijalva
Becerra	Davis (CA)	Grothman
Benishek	Davis, Danny	Gutiérrez
Bera	Davis, Rodney	Hahn
Beyer	DeFazio	Hanna
Bishop (GA)	DeGette	Hastings
Bishop (UT)	Delaney	Heck (NV)
Blum	DeLauro	Heck (WA)
Blumenauer	DelBene	Higgins
Bonamici	DeSantis	Himes
Brady (PA)	DeSaulnier	Hinojosa
Brooks (AL)	Deutch	Honda
Brownley (CA)	Dingell	Hoyer
Buck	Doggett	Huffman
Bustos	Dold	Hunter
Butterfield	Donovan	Israel
Capps	Doyle, Michael	Jeffries
Capuano	F.	Johnson (GA)
Cárdenas	Duckworth	Johnson, E. B.
Carney	Duncan (SC)	Jones
Carson (IN)	Duncan (TN)	Joyce
Cartwright	Edwards	Kaptur
Castor (FL)	Ellison	Kelly (IL)
Castro (TX)	Ellmers (NC)	Kildee
Chaffetz	Emmer (MN)	Kilmer
Chu, Judy	Engel	Kind
Cicilline	Eshoo	King (NY)
Clark (MA)	Esty	Kinzinger (IL)
Clarke (NY)	Farr	Kirkpatrick
Clay	Fattah	Kuster
Clyburn	Foster	Labrador
Coffman	Frankel (FL)	Langevin
Cohen	Fudge	Larsen (WA)
Collins (NY)	Gabbard	Larson (CT)
Connolly	Gallego	Lawrence
Conyers	Garamendi	Lee
Cooper	Garrett	Lewis
Costa	Gibson	Lieu, Ted
Costello (PA)	Graham	LoBiondo
Courtney	Graves (GA)	Loeb sack

Sewell (AL)
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Speier
Stefanik
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin
Zinke

Nunes
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Pittenger
Pitts
Poliquin
Pompeo
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Roskam
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Ruiz
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Trott
Turner
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman

Westmoreland Wilson (SC) Woodall
Whitfield Wiltman Yoder
Williams Womack Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—5

Adams Boyle, Hurt (VA) Roe (TN)
Brendan F. Jackson Lee

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1424

Messrs. COLE and ASHFORD
changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”
So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from California (Mr.
MCCLINTOCK) on which further pro-
ceedings were postponed and on which
the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 206, noes 222,
not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 285]

AYES—206

Aguilar	Delaney	Kaptur
Amash	DeLauro	Kelly (IL)
Becerra	DelBene	Kildee
Benishek	DeSantis	Kilmer
Bera	DeSaulnier	Kind
Beyer	Deutch	Kirkpatrick
Bishop (GA)	Doggett	Kuster
Bishop (UT)	Doyle, Michael	Labrador
Blum	F.	Langevin
Blumenauer	Duckworth	Larsen (WA)
Bonamici	Duncan (SC)	Larson (CT)
Brady (PA)	Edwards	Lawrence
Brooks (AL)	Ellison	Lee
Brown (FL)	Ellmers (NC)	Lewis
Brownley (CA)	Emmer (MN)	Lieu, Ted
Buchanan	Engel	LoBiondo
Buck	Eshoo	Loeb
Bustos	Esty	Lofgren
Butterfield	Farr	Loudermilk
Capps	Fattah	Lowenthal
Capuano	Foster	Lowey
Cárdenas	Frankel (FL)	Lujan Grisham
Carney	Fudge	(NM)
Carson (IN)	Gabbard	Lujan, Ben Ray
Cartwright	Galleo	(NM)
Castor (FL)	Garamendi	Lummis
Castro (TX)	Garrett	Maloney,
Chu, Judy	Graves (GA)	Carolyn
Cicilline	Grayson	Maloney, Sean
Clark (MA)	Green, Al	Massie
Clay	Grijalva	Matsui
Clyburn	Gutiérrez	McClintock
Coffman	Hahn	McCollum
Cohen	Hastings	McDermott
Collins (NY)	Heck (NV)	McGovern
Connolly	Heck (WA)	McNery
Conyers	Higgins	Meeks
Costa	Himes	Meng
Costello (PA)	Honda	Moore
Courtney	Hoyer	Moulton
Crowley	Huffman	Mulvaney
Cummings	Hunter	Murphy (FL)
Curbelo (FL)	Israel	Nadler
Davis (CA)	Jeffries	Napolitano
Davis, Danny	Johnson (GA)	Neal
Davis, Rodney	Johnson, E. B.	Newhouse
DeFazio	Jones	Nolan
DeGette	Joyce	Norcross

O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascarella
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ruiz

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Black
Blackburn
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Cleaver
Cole
Collins (GA)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Denham
Dent
Long
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox
Frank (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)

NOES—222

Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Hinojosa
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Katko
Keating
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Levin
Lipinski
Long
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lynch
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy
McCaull
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes

Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano

Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Roby
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tonko
Trott
Turner
Valadao
Veasey
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Wasserman
Schultz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman

Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (IA)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—4

Adams Boyle, Brendan F. Jackson Lee
Roe (TN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1429

Mr. LOEBSACK changed his vote
from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PERRY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr.
PERRY) on which further proceedings
were postponed and on which the noes
prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 297, noes 130,
not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 286]

AYES—297

Aguilar	Conyers	Garamendi
Allen	Cooper	Garrett
Amash	Costa	Gibson
Ashford	Costello (PA)	Gohmert
Barletta	Courtney	Gowdy
Barr	Cramer	Graham
Bass	Crowley	Graves (GA)
Beatty	Cuellar	Graves (LA)
Becerra	Cummings	Grayson
Benishek	Curbelo (FL)	Green, Al
Bera	Davis (CA)	Green, Gene
Beyer	Davis, Danny	Grijalva
Bishop (GA)	Davis, Rodney	Grothman
Bishop (UT)	DeFazio	Guinta
Blum	DeGette	Gutiérrez
Blumenauer	Delaney	Hahn
Bonamici	DeLauro	Hanna
Brady (PA)	DelBene	Harper
Brat	Denham	Hastings
Brooks (AL)	DeSantis	Heck (NV)
Brown (FL)	DeSaulnier	Heck (WA)
Brownley (CA)	DesJarlais	Herrera Beutler
Buck	Deutch	Higgins
Burgess	Dingell	Himes
Bustos	Doggett	Hinojosa
Butterfield	Dold	Honda
Calvert	Donovan	Hoyer
Capps	Doyle, Michael	Huffman
Capuano	F.	Hunter
Cárdenas	Duckworth	Hurd (TX)
Carney	Duffy	Hurt (VA)
Carson (IN)	Duncan (SC)	Israel
Cartwright	Duncan (TN)	Jeffries
Castor (FL)	Edwards	Johnson (GA)
Castro (TX)	Ellison	Johnson, E. B.
Chaffetz	Ellmers (NC)	Johnson, Sam
Chu, Judy	Emmer (MN)	Jones
Cicilline	Engel	Joyce
Clark (MA)	Eshoo	Kaptur
Clarke (NY)	Esty	Kelly (IL)
Clawson (FL)	Farenthold	Kildee
Clay	Farr	Kilmer
Clyburn	Fattah	Kind
Coffman	Fitzpatrick	King (NY)
Cohen	Foster	Kinzinger (IL)
Collins (GA)	Frankel (FL)	Kirkpatrick
Collins (NY)	Gabbard	Kline
Conaway	Galleo	Kuster
Connolly		Labrador

LaMalfa Norcross
Lance Nugent
Langevin O'Rourke
Larsen (WA) Olson
Larson (CT) Pallone
Lawrence Palmer
Lee Pascrell
Levin Paulsen
Lewis Payne
Lieu, Ted Pelosi
Lipinski Perlmutter
LoBiondo Perry
Loeb sack Peters
Loifgren Peterson
Long Pingree
Loudermilk Pocan
Love Poe (TX)
Lowenthal Poliquin
Lowe Polis
Luetkemeyer Price (NC)
Lujan Grisham Price, Tom
(NM) Quigley
Luján, Ben Ray Rangel
(NM) Reed
Lummis Reichert
Maloney Ribble
Carolyn Rice (NY)
Maloney, Sean Rice (SC)
Marchant Richmond
Massie Rigell
Matsui Rogers (AL)
McCaul Rohrabacher
McClintock Rooney (FL)
McCollum Ros-Lehtinen
McDermott Ross
McGovern Roybal-Allard
McMorris Royce
Rodgers Ruiz
McNerney Ruppertsberger
Meeks Ryan (OH)
Meng Ryan (WI)
Miller (FL) Sánchez, Linda
Mooney (WV) T.
Moore Sanchez, Loretta
Moulton Sanford
Mulvaney Sarbanes
Murphy (FL) Schakowsky
Murphy (PA) Schiff
Nadler Schrader
Napolitano Schweikert
Neal Scott (VA)
Newhouse Scott, Austin
Nolan Scott, David

NOES—130

Abraham Guthrie
Aderholt Hardy
Amodei Harris
Babin Hartzler
Barton Hensarling
Bilirakis Hice, Jody B.
Bishop (MI) Hill
Black Holding
Blackburn Hudson
Bost Huelskamp
Boustany Huizenga (MI)
Brady (TX) Hultgren
Bridenstine Issa
Brooks (IN) Jenkins (KS)
Buchanan Jenkins (WV)
Bucshon Johnson (OH)
Byrne Jolly
Carter (GA) Jordan
Carter (TX) Katko
Chabot Keating
Cleaver Kelly (PA)
Cole Kennedy
Comstock King (IA)
Cook Knight
Crawford Lamborn
Crenshaw Latta
Culberson Lucas
Dent Lynch
Diaz-Balart MacArthur
Fincher Marino
Fleischmann McCarthy
Fleming McHenry
Flores McKinley
Forbes McSally
Fortenberry Meadows
Foxx Meehan
Franks (AZ) Messer
Frelinghuysen Mica
Gibbs Miller (MI)
Goodlatte Moolenaar
Gosar Mullin
Granger Neugebauer
Graves (MO) Noem
Griffith Nunes

Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walden
Walker
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Westmoreland
Wilson (FL)
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—5
Adams Jackson Lee
Boyle, Brendan Roe (TN)
F. Yarmuth
ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1433

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”
So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.
The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE
The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.
A recorded vote was ordered.
The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 232, noes 196, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 287]

AYES—232

Abraham Donovan
Aderholt Duffy
Allen Duncan (SC)
Amash Duncan (TN)
Amodei Ellmers (NC)
Babin Emmer (MN)
Barletta Farenthold
Barr Fincher
Barton Fitzpatrick
Benishek Fleischmann
Bilirakis Fleming
Bishop (MI) Flores
Bishop (UT) Forbes
Black Fortenberry
Blackburn Foxx
Blum Franks (AZ)
Bost Garrett
Brady (TX) Gibbs
Brat Gohmert
Bridenstine Goodlatte
Brooks (AL) Gosar
Brooks (IN) Gowdy
Buchanan Granger
Buck Graves (GA)
Bucshon Graves (LA)
Burgess Graves (MO)
Byrne Griffith
Calvert Grothman
Carter (GA) Guinta
Carter (TX) Guthrie
Chabot Hardy
Chaffetz Harper
Clawson (FL) Harris
Coffman Hartzler
Cole Heck (NV)
Collins (GA) Hensarling
Collins (NY) Herrera Beutler
Comstock Hice, Jody B.
Conaway Hill
Cook Holding
Costello (PA) Hudson
Cramer Huelskamp
Crawford Huizenga (MI)
Crenshaw Hultgren
Culberson Hunter
Davis, Rodney Hurd (TX)
Denham Hurt (VA)
Dent Issa
DeSantis Jenkins (KS)
DesJarlais Jenkins (WV)
Diaz-Balart Johnson (OH)

Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross

Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott

NOES—196

Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard

Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Loifgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano

Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppertsberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Turner
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—4

Adams Boyle, Brendan Jackson Lee
F. Roe (TN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1438

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Chair, I was unable to vote today because of the death of a close friend. Had I been present, I would have voted: rollcall No. 274—"aye," rollcall No. 275—"aye," rollcall No. 276—"nay," rollcall No. 277—"nay," rollcall No. 278—"nay," rollcall No. 279—"nay," rollcall No. 280—"nay," rollcall No. 281—"nay," rollcall No. 282—"nay," rollcall No. 283—"nay," rollcall No. 284—"aye," rollcall No. 285—"nay," rollcall No. 286—"nay," rollcall No. 287—"aye."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MASSIE

Mr. MASSIE. I have an amendment
at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report
the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of section 7606 ("Legitimacy of Industrial Hemp Research") of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-79) by the Department of Justice or the Drug Enforcement Administration.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Kentucky and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

□ 1445

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today with four of my colleagues to offer a bipartisan amendment that simply requires the DEA to comply with Federal law.

The passage of our amendment to the 2014 farm bill legalized the cultivation of industrial hemp for research purposes and has allowed for the establishment of industrial hemp pilot programs in States across the country. In fact, in my home State of Kentucky alone, nearly 1,800 acres of hemp are projected to be grown this summer in these pilot programs.

However, despite the clear language of our farm bill amendment that specifically states that State agriculture agencies and universities will be growing the industrial hemp for research, the DEA has continuously ignored the plain text of the Federal statute.

The DEA continues to waste valuable time and taxpayer dollars by holding up non-psychoactive hemp seeds destined for legitimate hemp pilot programs.

Last year, officials from the State of Kentucky were forced to file a lawsuit in Federal court to compel the DEA to release industrial hemp seeds for university pilot programs. This year, par-

ticipants in hemp pilot programs in Kentucky and other States did not receive their seeds until just a few weeks before the start of the growing season.

The language is clear: State authorities, not the DEA, shall register the sites where hemp will be grown. The DEA's deliberate refusal to allow this simple fact has resulted in a broken process where the DEA obfuscates and delays.

Mr. Chairman, States cannot launch industrial hemp pilot programs if the DEA continues to violate Federal law by seizing and delaying shipments of hemp seeds before they reach their destination.

I urge a "yes" vote on our amendment to require the DEA to follow Federal law, and I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR).

Mr. BARR. In 2013, the Kentucky General Assembly passed Senate Bill 50, which exempted industrial hemp from the State's Controlled Substances Act but also mandated that Kentucky follow all Federal rules and regulations with respect to industrial hemp.

So, last year, I was proud to support an amendment to the 2014 farm bill, sponsored by my fellow Kentuckian, Congressman THOMAS MASSIE, which authorized State departments of agriculture in States where industrial hemp is legal to administer industrial hemp pilot programs for the purposes of research and development.

The Kentucky Department of Agriculture Industrial Hemp Pilot Research Program, in collaboration with my constituent, the University of Kentucky College of Agriculture, has since facilitated through permitted farmers the cultivation of nearly 2,000 acres of hemp this year alone in Kentucky.

Hemp is an important crop that holds tremendous commercial promise in Kentucky. In fact, former Speaker of the House Henry Clay was a large producer of industrial hemp. It can be used for food, horse bedding, animal feed, textiles, oils, lotions, cosmetics, rope, pharmaceuticals, et cetera.

Just last week, I met with a very sophisticated partnership of entrepreneurs, tobacco farmers, botanists, and even former law enforcement officials who have put up their own capital to invest in permanent industrial hemp projects, which they believe can spark a very profitable business.

This is about jobs.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition, even though I am not actually in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. HARRIS. I object. I rise to claim time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, the job of the DEA is not simple. The job of

the DEA is to stop drug use and drug abuse in the United States.

Sometimes the job isn't easy. When it comes to hemp, the job is not easy because, Mr. Chairman, hemp and marijuana are both cannabis, and you can't tell the seeds from one another. And it may be difficult for the DEA to determine because they are supposed to determine that the seeds used for hemp are below a certain level of THC—less than 0.3—and you can't tell by looking. You have to test and make certain that these seeds are in fact going to be used and qualify for the purposes of these pilot hemp programs.

The fact of the matter is there really is no evidence that the DEA does not comply with Federal law. They are fully complying with Federal law. The author of the amendment himself admitted that the seeds were there in time for planting. The fact of the matter is that this is not an easy job.

Under section 7606 of the 2014 farm bill, industrial hemp in pilot projects was authorized. Clearly, DEA licenses are not needed if they are granted through the State departments of agriculture or academic institutions. And the programs are proceeding.

The fact of the matter is that this amendment obfuscates the distinction between marijuana and hemp. It partially ties the hands of DEA to do what they need to do, which is to function as controllers of drugs in this country.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING).

Mr. FLEMING. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I certainly agree with Dr. HARRIS. I rise also in opposition to this amendment.

Cultivation of cannabis for industrial purposes is governed by the Controlled Substances Act, and that includes hemp. It is permitted pursuant to the registration requirements found in title 21, United States Code.

In addition, the Agricultural Act of 2014 permits "institutions of higher learning and State Departments of Agriculture to grow or cultivate industrial hemp."

But let's make one thing clear. The DOJ says they have no intention at all of interfering with what has been provided for in this Department of Agriculture permit. But they still have control, they still have oversight responsibility, and as a result of that, they should do that.

Now, if there is any delay along the way, certainly we should help with that. We should facilitate administratively. But the potential for abuse here is very significant. The DEA and law enforcement must retain control and oversight of hemp, which is a cannabis, just like marijuana.

Mr. HARRIS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. MASSIE. I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR).

Mr. BARR. To my good friend from Maryland, Dr. HARRIS, just a quick response. We are talking about State-licensed programs where the law enforcement officials in Kentucky can identify permitted land where this hemp is grown. If it is on an unpermitted place, whether it is otherwise legal industrial hemp or marijuana, it would be illegal if it is not on a permitted piece of property. So there is no conflict with law enforcement.

But the fact of the matter is that last year the DEA delayed the seeds and delayed the planting of this legitimate, lawful, federally authorized industrial hemp project.

This is about jobs. This is not about marijuana. In fact, as my voting record just demonstrated in the last series of votes, I voted against every single amendment that would have decriminalized or facilitated marijuana. This is not about marijuana. This is about low-THC industrial hemp, and it is about jobs.

Mr. MASSIE. I yield 1 minute to my colleague from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy and I appreciate his leadership, focused like a laser on something that is not like marijuana.

For generations, Americans have used hemp. It has just been recently that it has been compromised. So we have to import hemp from overseas to make perfectly legal hemp products that you can buy in any American city.

This is an important step forward to be able to allow Kentucky and Oregon farmers to do something that they have done for generations. It is about economic development. It is about being rational. And it is about being able to focus on things that are important.

I deeply appreciate the gentleman's focus and patience keeping us on message here to be able to make sure that we are not having Federal interference for something that is State supervised and where States around the country want to allow this for their farmers and their ranchers.

I think it is an important step forward, and I appreciate his leadership in permitting me to speak on it.

Mr. MASSIE. I certainly thank the gentleman from Oregon, and I would just say that these hemp pilot programs have been tremendous in Kentucky. And they have answered all the questions, like the questions law enforcement had. They came and visited the fields. They said: "You are right; there is no big deal here. This is okay."

And so that is the important thing about these hemp programs, and we need to keep them going, and we need to take it to the level. We can't afford delays. You can't afford a delay when the weather is not always cooperating with you. A week, 2 weeks could ruin you.

So I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment. It is just common

sense. All we are asking is to follow the law. How hard is that?

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HARRIS. May I inquire of the Chair how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, let's review what we have. What we have is a situation where last year it wasn't the DEA that held up the seeds; it was getting an import license. And then subsequent to that, obviously the DEA had to test those seeds.

The U.S. Congress has set out a very clear plan for how we are going to increase the use of industrial hemp in this country, and it involves, first, pilot programs in States where it is legal, like Kentucky, like Oregon, but subject to the oversight under the Controlled Substances Act of the DEA.

The DEA has to be certain, since all seeds are now imported. Eventually, under this plan, they won't be. Obviously, at some point we will progress to a point where our industrial hemp seeds are grown here in the United States, but they are not now.

Importing seeds and testing them is not a quick process, but it is a process that has to be done. The fact of the matter is hemp and marijuana are both cannabis. They are related. You can't tell the seeds apart. You have to test these seeds.

Our drug problem is serious. I am glad I don't have to do the job the DEA does dealing with controlling drugs that destroy lives in this country. Sure, is it a process that sometimes might take time? Yes. But that time is well worth taking.

Down the road, we are going to get to the proper industrial hemp production. It has got to be done under controlled processes. The DEA has these in place. The Department of Agriculture has these protocols in place. State departments of agriculture do.

This amendment is just unnecessary. And worse than that, it obscures the fact that it could tie DEA's hands from doing what it needs to do, which is controlling dangerous substances.

I urge the body to reject the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MASSIE

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to treat ammunition as armor piercing for purposes of chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, except for ammunition designed and intended for use in a handgun (in accordance with 18 U.S.C. section 921(a)(17)).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Kentucky and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, back in March, the ATF backed off on a controversial proposal to restrict the use of so-called "green tip" ammunition, some of the most popular ammunition in the country. In fact, it is used in the popular rifle, the AR-15.

The BATFE received over 80,000 comments, primarily from citizens who opposed the Bureau's attempt to restrict their Second Amendment rights. And so the ATF rescinded its proposal.

In my opinion, the proposed restriction was based on a flawed application of chapter 44 of title 18 of the United States Code. If you go back and look at the debate that occurred in Congress, you will see that the legislation that was written was clearly meant to cover handgun ammunition. It was never meant to cover rifle ammunition.

In fact, there was a debate at the time whether they should limit so-called "armor-piercing" ammunition by its functionality—in other words, its efficacy—or whether they should limit it by its design. And they chose to limit it by its design. Because if you limit it by its functionality, what you will find out is darn near all rifle ammunition, unfortunately, will penetrate the common vest. In fact, the most lethal are deer rifles. And so a deer rifle is more lethal in terms of penetrating a vest than would be, say, a so-called assault rifle that shoots a much smaller caliber.

In any case, what happened is one pistol was made and came on the market—or a few pistols were made, handguns were made—that could be chambered with this round, but the round was designed and intended for use in a rifle, not in a handgun.

□ 1500

The clear text of the statute, in my opinion, excludes rifle rounds, but what has happened is recently, the ATF—now, this is only one example that I have recently—they proposed to ban the green tip ammunition, otherwise known as M855 or SS109. This is 223, also known as 556 ammunition. Well, there was a lot of public backlash, and so they backed off of that.

What a lot of people don't know is they already did ban some ammunition with this flawed interpretation. They banned the 7N6, which is a 5.45 by 39 round, and so it was a mistake that happened, and we need to correct this mistake.

We need to prevent future mistakes. The best way to do this is to withhold funding for flawed interpretations.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FATTAH. I was in support of the gentleman's first amendment; but, in this instance, we are at a different point of view.

I note that the majority has a lot of enthusiasm for gun amendments on this appropriations bill, and it is making it almost impossible for us to deal with the challenges for the subcommittee around spending when we keep getting mired down in this, these gun policy riders.

I would just say that it is obviously the majority's view that this somehow is an appropriate vehicle to express your love for guns of all types, ammunition of all types.

I think that my view would be we should make it permissible for any gun that you could bring into the Capitol, you should be able to bring into schools or colleges, or any ammunition you could bring into the Capitol, you could use in any weapon. That might be a way to proceed.

The majority doesn't have any enthusiasm for the Second Amendment when it comes to people coming into the United States Capitol because we know that guns can be dangerous. We know that people can be harmed.

We know, in fact, that there were Members, when an attack happened right here on this floor—that is why we have, on the back of these chairs, certain protections—who were shot from this balcony.

We know the dangers of guns and ammunition, and it is unfortunate that we would use an appropriations vehicle to move these policy matters, which are controversial.

You want to attach them to a must-pass appropriations bill, one that is about our economy and about innovation, and an appropriations bill that is dealing with a whole set of issues. You make it challenging for Members who have a different point of view on some of these controversial policy issues, like guns and the access to them.

Some might interpret the Second Amendment that says, if you want a bazooka or MX missile or whatever you want to have at your home, that somehow you have a right to have it.

There are others of us who think that reasonable regulation might be a better course of action, like the kind of reasonable regulation we have at the Capitol, which is that you can't bring a gun into this facility, unless you have some lawful reason to do so, and we regulate that very strictly.

I am in opposition to this amendment. I have nothing against my colleague, whom I enjoy working with on a whole range of issues. I agree with him on hemp, and I disagree with him on guns.

I hope that we can move this bill forward, as we have been trying to do

since the chairman's mark in the subcommittee, and not get it mired down in unnecessary, controversial items that are not attached to how much money we are going to spend for these various accounts to move these agencies of our government forward.

Mr. CULBERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FATTAH. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Chair, I thank my good friend from Pennsylvania. I do, as he knows, support this amendment because it has become necessary to put restrictions like this on the bill because the ATF, under President Obama, did attempt to prohibit 223 ammunition, which is used in one of the most popular and widely available sporting rifles in the United States.

The new Director of the ATF, Tom Brandon, I want to thank him and professional law enforcement officers at the ATF. They came in to see me when I was the brand-new chairman of the subcommittee earlier this year.

We had a very good visit. We looked at the statute, and Director Brandon and his chief counsel understood that the guidelines that they had created went beyond the statute. They recognized that they were going to have a very difficult budget year if they persisted in this effort to interfere with American's lawful, constitutional Second Amendment rights.

I was very grateful that Director Brandon chose to drop their attempted prohibition on 223 ammunition after our meeting and in response to the 80,000 letters and all the requests from Members of Congress. The ATF did the right thing here by dropping their attempt to ban ammunition.

Mr. MASSIE's amendment is necessary because I think it is important to make it clear that we don't want the Obama administration coming back and attempting to ban ammunition again.

I remember, as a student of American history, that General Gage, in Boston, didn't go after the weapons first. They went after the powder and the ammunition, I believe, Mr. MASSIE, in Lexington and Concord.

Mr. FATTAH. Reclaiming my time with just a question, Mr. Chairman, maybe you could inform me, but I believe that the restrictions on armor-piercing bullets predate the administration that you just named. Is that accurate?

Mr. CULBERSON. Yes, but the ATF was attempting to use—the statute says you cannot use armor-piercing ammunition that includes depleted uranium, beryllium, and it has some very specific things.

As Mr. MASSIE said, the Congress was focused on the content of the bullet, rather than what type of weapon it could be used in. In the ATF's guideline, actually, the ATF created a legal framework for analysis, which is fairly standard for this administration.

The Acting CHAIR (Mrs. BLACK). The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MASSIE. I gladly yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON), the chairman.

Mr. CULBERSON. Let me say that it is important to have Mr. MASSIE's language in this bill because the ATF, in this instance, just as in the EPA's attempt to regulate every square inch of the United States by saying navigable waters include any piece of ground on which the water drains off into a navigable stream, the EPA, the ATF, the Obama administration routinely uses what they call a legal framework for analysis to expand their executive authority far beyond what Congress intended.

In this instance, I was successful with the help of my colleagues. As the new chairman of the subcommittee, I was successful in persuading Director Brandon and the ATF to drop their attempt to ban 223 ammunition, and I will be monitoring them closely. I will be exercising very aggressive oversight over the ATF to ensure that they don't try it again.

I welcome Mr. MASSIE's amendment to help drive home the point that the Second Amendment of the United States Constitution is written in plain English, and it guarantees, absolutely, the right of Americans to keep and bear arms.

I welcome your amendment, Mr. MASSIE, and encourage Members to support it.

Mr. MASSIE. I appreciate that. I appreciate the effort that the chairman put in to making sure that our 556, 223 ammunition did not get banned. I appreciate my colleague from Pennsylvania's comments as well.

Let me say something. I am sympathetic to the ATF's job. We write some bad legislation here, okay. It is clear it has got gray areas. What I am trying to do is to clear up a gray area for them so that, when they go to work in the morning, they don't have to wonder should this apply to this or should this apply to this or not.

Even with the chairman's great efforts, the reason why this is necessary is because the same rationale that they were going to use to ban 556, they actually used a year or two ago to ban 5.45, which is a very similar round in composition and size and capacity. That is why this amendment is necessary.

My colleague from Pennsylvania is right. I do love guns; I have an enthusiasm, but the reason I am doing this is my respect for the Constitution. I understand you have respect for the Constitution as well; I do. We just interpret it a little bit differently.

This is not a bazooka amendment. This is just an ammunition amendment, and I am just trying to make sure this very popular caliber and other popular calibers are still able to be bought.

I appreciate the efforts that everybody puts in to making sure these laws are enforced. I just want to clear up this law. I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FATTAH. I am going to yield to the gentleman from New York on this point. I just want to say something.

The point I made was that this restriction on armor-piercing bullets did not emanate with this administration, even though some might want to suggest somehow that this is President Obama's effort.

This dates back to a different period of time, when we had a Republican President, and it was put into place to protect law enforcement because the children who have been unfortunate victims of gunshots in their schools or in movie theaters and other circumstances where we have had these mass shootings, they haven't been wearing bulletproof vests.

Bulletproof vests are used by our law enforcement officials. There was a concern to make sure that they could be protected while they were out protecting us, right? I just want to be clear, as we go forward, what we are doing here and so that everybody who takes an action on this and, however they may vote, understands that they are voting to provide a circumstance in which there won't be any restriction on the piercing power of the projectile, right?

When it is pointed at a human being, it can be deadly, so I just want us to be clear.

I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), and I will keep track that he doesn't go over 2 minutes.

Mr. ENGEL. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I must rise and oppose this amendment.

Earlier this year, ATF recognized the threat posed by armor-piercing handguns and tried to limit the sale of the green tip 556 round, which is the military-made armor-piercing round that fits into pistols. This would have made sense.

When ATF tried to make that change, the industry decried executive overreach and hidden administrative agendas and shouted down this commonsense proposal. I supported the ATF's proposal then, and I still believe that this and other commonsense regulations on armor-piercing handguns are sorely needed.

I introduced the APB Act to enact the ATF's proposed change into law because we have a responsibility to protect our police and our communities from these unreasonably dangerous weapons.

A hunter does not need a Sig Sauer P556 or an Extar EXP or any of the other pistols that can fire these armor-

piercing rounds. These concealed weapons serve only one purpose: to kill human beings wearing body armor.

ATF needs the authority to monitor and regulate firearms and ammunition. When technology advances, like it did with the green tip, ATF needs to be able to act to protect our neighborhoods and our law enforcement. This amendment, I believe, would needlessly strip ATF's authority to regulate dangerous armor-piercing bullets and put cops, kids, and our communities at risk.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment, and I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FATTAH. Text is most helpful when put in context. It is true that the Constitution says that it is a citizen's right to keep and bear arms, but it says that as part of a well-regulated militia.

When we want to focus in on the Second Amendment, it may be helpful for us to have a contextual framework in which the right is connected to responsible and regulated activity on behalf of our community.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Chair, I move to strike the last word for a very important clarification.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CULBERSON. My colleague, Mr. ENGEL, I think may not have the exact amendment in front of him because all Mr. MASSIE is attempting to do is enforce existing law and make it clear that the ATF has to enforce existing law, as written, and that armor-piercing ammunition cannot be used in handguns.

□ 1515

That is what the law says. The law says an armor-piercing round is one that uses depleted uranium or other materials and is used in a handgun. And that is all this amendment says.

So we, by accepting this amendment, are enforcing existing law, which is to prevent the use of armor-piercing ammunition in a handgun. So it is important that, I think, everyone understand that that is all this amendment is intended to do. And I will, as subcommittee chairman, make certain that the ATF does not interfere with Americans' Second Amendment rights under the Constitution and that the ATF is enforcing the law, as written by Congress, which is precisely what the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE) is doing, and I urge Members to support his amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further pro-

ceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MASSIE

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk regarding the National Institute of Standards and Technology.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 543. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the National Institute of Standards and Technology to consult with the National Security Agency or the Central Intelligence Agency to alter cryptographic or computer standards, except to improve information security (in accordance with section 20(c)(1)(A) of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278g-3(c)(1)(A))).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Kentucky and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Chair, In December of 2013, news broke—and this was in a Reuters article—that, as a key part of a “campaign to embed encryption software that it could crack into widely used computer products, the U.S. National Security Agency arranged a secret \$10 million contract with” a private company—in fact, “one of the most influential firms in the computer security industry.”

It was further disclosed that “an algorithm called Dual Elliptic Curve . . . was on the road to approval by the National Institute of Standards and Technology as one of four acceptable methods for generating random numbers.”

The company adopted this algorithm, knowing that it would be used as a standard, and it was, as expected, approved by the National Institute of Standards and Technology. But “within a year, major questions were raised about Dual Elliptic Curve. Cryptography authority Bruce Schneier wrote that the weakness in the formula ‘can only be described as a back door.’”

This is just one example of the NSA exploiting its relationship with NIST to weaken encryption standards.

Look, NIST, we would like for them to set the highest standards for our country, particularly when it comes to encryption. Weakened encryption standards allow the NSA to snoop on Americans without a warrant.

So these back doors in encryption products are bad for privacy. It makes it just way too easy to violate our Fourth Amendment.

But back doors in encryption software are also bad for security. Think about this: Don't you want the best security available that the minds in this country can create, produce, to safeguard your health records, maybe to safeguard your gun records, maybe to safeguard your bank accounts and your credit cards.

We are more safe when we have better security and better encryption. So it makes no sense for the National Institute of Standards and Technology to work with the NSA to weaken our encryption software.

Finally, putting back doors in products is bad for business. It is bad for privacy. It is bad for security. And it is bad for business.

Why is it bad for business? Why would somebody buy a product made in America if it is known that the standards in America are weaker than the standards elsewhere? You know, if there are back doors in products, it is not just the government that can use them: hackers will find them. In fact, once the weakness was exposed in this Dual Elliptic Curve, it made it very easy for people to hack into that, and the company had to say, Quit using this software. We found a weakness in it.

So I would urge people to vote for this amendment. What it does is it prevents the spending of money at the National Institute of Standards and Technology to work with the NSA to weaken our encryption.

The amendment does nothing to keep them from making better encryption, but they cannot weaken it. They cannot compromise it. They can't spend your tax dollars making American products and our government standards worse.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I support the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Chair, we accept the amendment, agree with the reasoning that the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE) has laid forth. I believe the amendment is acceptable to the minority as well. So the amendment is agreed to unanimously.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MASSIE. What is the balance of my time remaining, Madam Chair?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Chair, I will just summarize why this is an important amendment.

We trust the National Institute of Standards and Technology to perform their constitutionally mandated responsibilities. That is one of the great things about NIST: its authorization is in the Constitution, to set the standards of weights and measures. So I appreciate the job they do. But we put a lot of trust into them when they set these standards. And a lot of people make business decisions. It is kind of like the Good Housekeeping seal of approval, if I may use that analogy.

So, when we stamp something as a government-approved standard, we want to know it is the best in the world, that the United States has the

best encryption in their products, the best encryption. We want the products that our government buys to be safe. So it would be wrong for NIST to spend money working to put back doors in our products. That is why I urge our colleagues to vote for this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Houston, Texas (Mr. POE), my good friend and colleague.

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the chairman for yielding time to me.

Madam Chair, I would like to try to interpret what has been said in a simpler way.

Assume that the builders in the United States get together and they are given a new requirement: that when they build a new house, the Federal Government wants the option to have a master key to a back door—not only a back door but a secret back door so that at some time down the road, maybe the Federal Government would like to enter that secret back door for some purpose. And that is what this amendment is preventing.

Just like we wouldn't let the Federal Government have a key to our back door or require builders to put a master key in all of the new homes that they build in the country and give the key to the government, we would never allow that. That would certainly be in violation of the Fourth Amendment of the Constitution.

All this amendment does is it prevents technology—when technology is growing at a rapid rate—to prevent the Federal Government from requiring companies that make cell phones, for example, that there be an ability of the Federal Government to go in the cell phone and look around, even without the knowledge of the person who owns the cell phone. This is very similar to the bill that passed unanimously last night. So I urge the adoption to this amendment as well.

I thank the chairman for allowing me to speak on the gentleman from Kentucky's amendment, since he ran out of time.

Mr. CULBERSON. I am glad to do so.

Madam Chair, again, the amendment is agreed to unanimously. I strongly support the gentleman from Kentucky's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives Special Advisory entitled "Test, Examination and Classification of 7N6 5.45x39 Ammunition", dated April 7, 2014. The limitation described in this section shall not apply in the case of the administration of a tax or tariff.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Arizona and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chair, I rise today to stand with my colleague from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE) and with sportsmen and law-abiding gun owners throughout the country.

Over the course of the last year, we have seen numerous misguided attempts by the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives to misclassify ammunition as "armor-piercing" and infringe on the Second Amendment rights of our citizens.

At a forum I held at the end of March in Prescott, Arizona, a large number of my constituents expressed their outrage about ATF reclassifying the imported 7N6, commonly known as the 5.45 x 39 ammunition, as "armor-piercing," thus preventing this ammo from being imported.

7N6 ammo is very affordable and has been used for target practice by sportsmen for years. The administration—especially the ATF, as we have seen with Operation Fast and Furious and recent attempts to ban the green tip ammo—has a penchant for interpreting the law as it sees fit or as it is most convenient for them.

Fortunately, we have at least temporarily beaten back the attempt to ban the .223 green tip ammo after 230 different Members of this body, Chairman CULBERSON, and myself encouraged ATF to drop this misguided attempt. But the 7N6 ammunition ban is yet another example of Federal overreach on the part of the administration.

After years of having a sportsmen exemption, 7N6 was reclassified after ATF found an extremely rare and obscure Polish-made pistol that could supposedly use and shoot the 7N6 cartridge.

I strongly applaud the committee for including four other commonsense provisions in this bill that protect the Second Amendment.

I ask that this body stand with sportsmen throughout this country. I ask that my colleagues support this additional, commonsense provision to protect the Second Amendment and allow the 7N6 ammo to be used for target practice.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, I guess redundancy has some utility here because we have been around the rosie a number of times on this same issue, both late last night and now early this afternoon, one amendment after another amendment after another amendment, trying to make sure that our fascination with armor-piercing bullets doesn't escape this debate.

□ 1530

So here we have another one, and maybe there is something different about this one than the one before, but I am not able to discern what it is. I am opposed to it.

I think that people have a right to weapons under our Constitution. I think common sense suggests people should have a right to weapons, long guns, rifles, for both sports activities and for their own protection. I also think that it is a responsible thing for those who are governing our country to put in place reasonable regulations and restrictions just like the regulations and restrictions that we have here on the Capitol campus.

Not only do we spend hundreds of millions of dollars of taxpayers' money for our own police force to protect us, we also say that you can't bring a firearm into the buildings that we work in each and every day.

Now, we do this even though we come to the floor and profess our undying love for the unfettered notion of the Second Amendment as interpreted by some that you can have a gun anywhere, in a bar, in a park, in a school, in a daycare center, and at church. Take your gun and ride off into the wind with it. But we won't allow it here.

I am just waiting for a Member of the majority, since we have multiple amendments, to come to the floor and to say that people should be able to exercise their Second Amendment here when they visit the people's House, when they visit their elected Representatives, that somehow we want to welcome them and their guns with their armor-piercing bullets, and then I would know that you truly love the Second Amendment and that you see it as an unfettered right anywhere, anytime, and under any circumstances.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON), the chairman of the committee.

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Chair, I strongly support the gentleman's amendment, and it is necessary because the ATF, once again, here attempted to ban ammunition that could be used in a handgun that is otherwise commonly available for rifles. In the statute, the Congress intended to prohibit the use of armor-piercing ammunition for handguns. So the gentleman's amendment is necessary, and I strongly support the amendment as, again, additional protection for Ameri-

cans' constitutional Second Amendment rights to keep and bear arms.

I would point out to my good friend from Pennsylvania that at the Texas Capitol, concealed-carry permit holders are actually given a separate line so they can get into the capitol even more rapidly because law enforcement officers in Texas recognize that a concealed-carry permit holder is their best backup because they have had a background check and they are trained in the use of the weapon.

I coauthored the legislation in Texas in the 1990s to allow Texans to get a concealed-carry permit, and we have prevented a lot of crimes and saved a lot of lives. I don't think there has even been a fistfight among concealed-carry permit holders in Texas in all these years. They are given expedited access to the Texas Capitol because law enforcement recognizes an honest, law-abiding American with a concealed-carry permit is their best friend.

I support the gentleman's amendment, and I urge its passage.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE), my friend.

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman from Arizona's leadership on this issue, and my profound gratitude and immense respect to Chairman CULBERSON for making sure that this interpretation that was applied to 5.45 ammunition was not applied to 5.56. He has the gratitude of millions of gun owners in this country—law-abiding gun owners, I should say.

This travesty of justice still applies to this other caliber, using the same reasoning. I won't impugn the motives of the ATF. I won't do that. I think they are just trying to enforce the law. There is a gray area here, and I think this bill clears up that gray area for the benefit of millions of gun owners—law-abiding gun owners—in this country, and I thank Representative GOSAR for leading on this.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chair, what I would like to do is highlight that only an obscure pistol could use this 7N6 ammunition. So I was going out of the way for a very popular round that is used for target practice all over this country. So I would ask for support for my amendment.

I thank the gentleman for helping me, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ISSA

Mr. ISSA. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to operate or dis-

seminate a cell-site simulator or IMSI catcher in the United States except pursuant to a court order that identifies an individual, account, address, or personal device

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. ISSA. Madam Chair, I rise today to offer this amendment, and it becomes necessary because selective spying by using these devices commonly called StingRays or cell site simulators or IMSI catchers has become a reality.

These sophisticated, affordable mobile devices in fact spoof or convince your phone that they are a valid cell tower and allow for the gathering of communications content, including texts and emails.

What is disturbing is that Federal dollars may be being used to capture tens of thousands of Americans' information without a warrant. The Wall Street Journal, The Washington Post, the Associated Press, and more have, in fact, uncovered cases of nationwide use by the FBI and other agencies working to cover up StingRay use in instances in which they have, among other things, dropped criminal cases to avoid having to disclose their use of them. Additionally, they have entered into nondisclosure agreements at times in order to not do so.

Just a month ago, this House—and the Senate, a few days ago—passed, overwhelmingly, a new authorization of the PATRIOT Act. We did so with a careful balance between what our government can do to us and what protections we have, and particularly the Fourth Amendment.

This is a narrowly crafted amendment. It in no way stops the use of these devices when a Federal court has ordered and allowed the use, either a FISA court or a common warrant issued by a judge.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition, but I am not in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, I concur with the gentleman's amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ISSA. At this time, Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD).

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Madam Chair, I rise in support of our amendment today that I am working on with Mr. ISSA.

Madam Chair, the Associated Press reported yesterday that they confirmed reports that the FBI is flying surveillance cameras in aircraft over the U.S. with these devices. They are operated sometimes through shell companies that use video and StingRay technology to capture data on Americans

in bulk both visually and from our cell phones.

This flies in the face of every concept of liberty and privacy that we cherish in this country. Our Founding Fathers would be sickened if they found out how far we have slipped. As much as I have been encouraged by the fact that both Houses of Congress have passed the USA FREEDOM Act to end bulk surveillance under section 215 of the PATRIOT Act, reports like this show me we still have a long way to go.

This secretive FBI program to hack into our cellphones seems far from appropriate and constitutional, and it must be curtailed. This amendment would ensure that any usage of this program would only happen through a court order targeting a specific individual and never as a dragnet for bulk surveillance.

I am happy to hear that there is very little opposition to this, and I look forward to working to continue to regain our liberty from mass and unconstitutional surveillance.

Mr. ISSA. Madam Chair, I have no further speakers. I urge passage, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLORES

Mr. FLORES. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to further implementation of the coastal and marine spatial planning and ecosystem-based management components of the National Ocean Policy developed under Executive Order 13547.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, I rise to assert a point of order on this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. FLORES. Madam Chair, this amendment does not change existing law. It just removes the funding for an unconstitutional, unstatutory action by the President.

□ 1545

Madam Chair, it seems like I have caused some excitement with the Parliamentarian this afternoon, so why don't I do this.

I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment and go to the second Flores amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLORES

Mr. FLORES. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement Executive Order 13547 (75 Fed. Reg. 43023, relating to the stewardship of oceans, coasts, and the Great Lakes), including the National Ocean Policy developed under such Executive Order.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FLORES. Madam Chair, I rise today to offer a simple amendment to address an ongoing overreach by the executive branch of our government.

My amendment bans the use of Federal funds for the implementation of Executive Order 13547. That executive order, which was signed in 2010, requires that 60-plus bureaucracies, as shown on this chart, essentially zone the oceans and the sources thereof.

This amendment addresses a critical executive branch encroachment into the powers of Congress as set forth in our Constitution. The activities being conducted by Executive Order 13547 have not been authorized by Congress, nor have appropriations been made by Congress to fund those activities.

Madam Chair, since 2010, this body has voted six times in support of this amendment in a bipartisan manner. This language was also included in the base text of the fiscal year 2016 Energy and Water Development Appropriations bill. Today, I am offering my amendment again because concerns have been raised that the effects of the National Ocean Policy extend well beyond restricting ocean activities and encroach into inland activities.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, I visited Chicago a few years back for the coastal zone conference to talk about how important it was that this administration has finally put forward, and we support, an ocean policy. There have been since 2012 over 15 different amendments seeking to undermine responsible ecosystem-based management of our oceans.

As appropriators, we have not been willing to accept these efforts to under-

mine this. We understand we have a responsibility as stewards. In fact, as a Nation we have more responsibility for the world's oceans than any other Nation in terms of territorially in the world.

We have some challenging circumstances. It is good that we now have a policy going forward. I would ask that the House oppose this amendment.

I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), the former mayor and a great Congressman.

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Chair, I rise in strong opposition to the Flores amendment, which would prohibit the implementation of the National Ocean Policy, which permits better coordination among Federal agencies responsible for coastal planning.

This amendment, in particular, would undermine NOAA's participation in planning, it would hurt States and communities, businesses, and would impede States like Rhode Island from managing their own resources in a way that best fits their needs and priorities.

This administration has made it clear that the National Ocean Policy does not create new regulations, supersede current regulations, or modify any agency's established mission, jurisdiction, or authority. Rather, it helps coordinate the implementation of existing regulations by Federal agencies to establish a more efficient and effective decisionmaking process.

In the Northeast, our regional ocean council has allowed our State to pool resources and businesses to have a voice in decisionmaking and has coordinated with Federal partners to ensure all stakeholders have a voice in the process.

It is astounding to me that since 2012, 15 riders undermining ocean planning have been introduced to House bills, including riders on two previous CJS appropriations bills.

Allowing Federal agencies to coordinate implementation of over 100 ocean laws and giving States and local governments a voice in the ocean planning process is smart public policy.

I urge my colleagues to reject this misguided amendment and to understand and accept our responsibility to be good stewards of our oceans. That is what the administration's policy does. This is allowing agencies to coordinate that work in a thoughtful, strategic, and smart way.

Mr. FLORES. Madam Chair, I again reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, who has the right to close?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has the right to close.

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLORES. Madam Chair, first of all, I think it is important to set the record straight. The issue here is not whether or not we want to take care of our oceans. All of us want to take care of our oceans. All of us believe in managing the ocean economy, the ocean

ecology. We also believe in trying to make sure that we have a government that adheres to this Constitution. Under article I of that Constitution, all legislative powers are reserved to this body, to this Congress, not to the President. That is the issue at stake here. The President has overstepped his constitutional statutory bounds.

Now, in the year 2000, Congress did pass something during the 106th Congress to create an ocean commission to review and make recommendations. Since then, the 108th, 109th, 110th, and 111th Congresses each looked at those recommendations and decided to take no legislative action.

That is what caused the President to move forward with his executive order to try to go around Congress. There are no appropriations. We have asked the Department for this function specifically. We have asked the Department of Interior specifically to provide their statutory support for the President's actions. They have provided none. So the President has gone around Congress by signing these executive orders.

There are 67 groups that include fishing, agricultural, farming, energy, and other industries that are concerned about the impact of this Federal overreach—and again, I would say an unconstitutional Federal overreach.

Again, this is a simple amendment that just stands up for the constitutional rights of this Congress to create the statutes under which this activity can be conducted and to transparently appropriate the funds for this activity should it so choose.

We are not against ocean planning, as I said at the outset of this. What we are for, though, is for the Constitution and to stand up for our congressional rights to enact the statutes related to this activity and for the appropriators to be able to transparently appropriate the money.

Again, this amendment has been adopted with bipartisan support six times over the last 4½ years and is already included in the base text of the fiscal year 2016 Energy and Water Appropriations bill.

I want to thank Chairman CULBERSON for considering this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, can I inquire how much time is remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

What selective memory you have. You say that the President is abusing his authority. Do you know who first asked for this? President Bush. He is the one that created the Commission and asked for those recommendations.

And guess what? Five Republicans authored that bill—Republicans Greenwood, Bilbray, Gilchrest, Horn, and

Franks. That was in 2000 and 2004 they introduced it. The bill went to committee, and the committee never heard the bill. So don't say that Congress never had a chance to enact this thing. Congress refused, just like Congress refuses to respond to the President's ask that we ought to decide whether we ought to go to war in the Middle East.

You are very selective. You say, Don't let the President make these executive orders, and then when he does you want to sue him because it is about immigration or issues like that. You criticize this President because Congress fails to take action, even after Presidents—Republican and Democratic Presidents—have asked Congress to take action, and we refused. And now you get up and say, Well, because we refused, you took executive action, therefore, we ought to not allow it to be implemented.

The Acting CHAIR. Members will address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. FARR. Thank you, Madam Chair. I am referring the remarks to the Madam Chair.

Look, deleting this ability for the National Ocean Policy—by the way, we haven't appropriated money. No money is being spent on it. But we are smart about getting 70 or 80 Federal agencies together to have one stop to figure out how we can get all these permits. That is why the fishermen support it.

I live in a coastal community. The author of this does not. We make our living off the ocean. And, by God, we want all the regulatory agencies to be in sync. And one of the policies here is, let's have a healthy ocean. What is wrong with that?

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, if the oceans die, it is impossible for us to live.

The Pew Foundation in Philadelphia has put hundreds of millions of dollars behind efforts around ocean science. My friend, Gerry Lenfest, has put a lot of his own fortune behind this effort. When I first got to the Congress, I was chair of the Friends of the Caribbean Caucus. We should do better by our oceans.

I ask that we oppose this, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. FATTAH. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DUNCAN OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to prosecute or hold liable any person or corporation for a violation of section 2(a) of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. 703(a)).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from South Carolina and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Madam Chair, the question we should ask ourselves is, should green energy companies be held liable for incidental deaths of birds of prey or migratory birds as a result of them flying into wind turbines or onto solar arrays.

As you may know, the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 and the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act, while well-intentioned, are significantly outdated.

Under current law, the accidental death of a protected bird is punishable as a misdemeanor; a second offense can be charged as a felony. This includes accidental deaths caused by wind turbines and solar panels.

The MBTA covers over 1,000 different species of birds. The Migratory Bird Treaty Act and the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act were written to target the intentional killing of migratory birds and birds of prey. I don't think anybody believes that accidental deaths as a result of solar panels or wind energy production warrants felony prosecution.

Every year, cars, trucks, sky-scrapers, windmills, oil platforms, airplanes, and houses with big windows cause the deaths of hundreds of thousands of these protected birds, doing things that are otherwise well within the law but that make drivers, pilots, property owners, and green energy companies potential felons under a strict interpretation of an outdated law.

As you can imagine, the enforcement of this law is pretty spotty, with bureaucrats selectively enforcing these regulations, creating uncertainty in the green energy marketplace.

President Obama's Fish and Wildlife Service recently announced plans to study the possibility of creating a permitting regime under the MBTA, which would allow for incidental and accidental take without criminal penalty, and they have suspended prosecutions until this is worked out. I agree with this approach. That is consistent with a bill I introduced—my CLEAN Energy Producers Act, H.R. 493.

My amendment today to the Commerce-Justice-Science Appropriations bill will suspend further prosecutions for incidental avian deaths under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act until this incidental take permitting regime is implemented.

I believe this is the right step as we move toward permanent reforms of the MBTA and the BGEPA as a part of the

national all-of-the-above energy independence strategy.

I would urge a “yes” vote on this important issue, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1600

Mr. FARR. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FARR. Madam Chair, what is broken that needs fixing? These are laws that have been in place for 100 years. In fact, they are laws that have been implemented because the United States has signed treaties with other countries that share our migratory fowl, countries like Canada, Mexico, Japan, and Russia. These are treaties that require that we be responsible for the wildlife that flies over our air space and lands in our soil.

Migratory birds are integrated into a healthy, natural system. In many ways, they affect the predators, the prey, the seed dispensers, and the pollinators. They are really actively appreciated by millions of people. We have a society in America called the National Audubon Society. We make an awful lot of money in my district off watchable wildlife.

Why would we want to stop the laws that protect that wildlife? I think this is all about responsible management; but to have an amendment that says that none of the funds may be available to prosecute or hold liable any persons who have violated the law, you are dismantling law enforcement's ability to enforce the law where people have violated it—violated it.

I think the public of this country does appreciate their watchable wildlife, whether they are hunting it or whether they are viewing it, and a lot of people make money off of it. I don't think this amendment is at all constructive. You are upsetting 100 years of law and international responsibility that we have as a country in this hemisphere.

I oppose the amendment and ask people to vote against it.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Madam Chair, I am in full support of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. I am an avid water fowler; I am an avid hunter, and I see how the Migratory Bird Treaty Act has benefited the species from the heyday of the market hunting and what we saw in the early 1900s.

I believe that the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act were designed to talk about the intentional killing or overharvesting of migratory birds and potential killing of birds of prey.

Even the Obama administration recognizes that there is something wrong with how we prosecute these cases of incidental and accidental deaths. This simply takes what they are already doing and says let's just have a pause

until we can work this out in permanent law. That is all my amendment does.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FARR. Well, with all due respect, that is not what your law says. It says:

None of the funds made available by this act may be used to prosecute or hold liable any person or corporation for a violation of the provision of law found in section 703(a) of title 16 of the United States Code.

There is no language in here about working anything out. There is no language about being responsible managers of the land or flyways.

Yes, we have a lot of new equipment up in our energy business, our wind energy and our solar energy. Those things, obviously way before you build them, you are supposed to take into account whether they are being built right in a flyway.

We have condors in our area that we have obviously spent a lot of money trying to revive. People actually spend money to come to very expensive hotels so that they can come see a condor. These are things that you want to protect.

To say that none of the funds can be made available to hold liable people that are violating the law seems to me just a reckless act to upset 100 years of wildlife management.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, if somebody has intentionally violated law, absolutely, they ought to be prosecuted. This amendment is in order because we are dealing with justice and how this is prosecuted. We are saying that the Justice Department can't expend any money to prosecute these incidental accidental deaths.

We need an interpretation of law. There is no doubt in my mind that we ought to revisit the MBTA and Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act, and we will. I am on the Natural Resources Committee. I promise you, this issue will come up; but I think it is appropriate to say we are going to hold off on expending any money by prosecuting these accidental incidental deaths.

I would urge my colleagues to vote for this. I think it is the right place and the right time.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chair, in closing, to say that the law says that those who are in violation of law—I mean, how many golden eagles do you have to kill and tell the law enforcement you can't do anything about it? This isn't about accidental death. This is people violating the law with an intent. You have to have an intent to do wrong.

I think this is a reckless amendment. I hope we defeat it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to collect information about individuals attending gun shows, by means of an automatic license plate reader, or to retain any information so collected.

Mr. FARR. I reserve a point of order on this issue.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Colorado and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, earlier this year, an email uncovered by the ACLU revealed that the Drug Enforcement Administration, DEA, and the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, or ATF, collaborated on a plan to use automatic license plate readers to monitor and collect information about law-abiding citizens attending gun shows.

Under this program, mere attendance at a gun show would have been enough to have one's attendance recorded in a massive DEA database. As if that weren't bad enough, the primary purpose of this database is asset forfeiture, a controversial practice of seizing motorists' possessions if police suspect they are criminal proceeds.

In response to inquiries about the uncovered document, the DEA has said that the proposal was rejected by superiors and never implemented. Keep in mind that this was taking place in Phoenix in 2009 at about the time of Fast and Furious, and there were, I believe, rogue projects going on in that part of the country at the time.

We have litigated that as a House against the Department of Justice, and they have not supplied the documents that they were supposed to have supplied to Congress.

We also held former Attorney General Eric Holder in contempt of Congress for not providing those documents. This was at a time when, perhaps, rogue projects were actually going on in Phoenix. I believe that they were, and I believe that this is one of those.

However, the DEA never supplied any documents saying that they rejected this project. They blamed it on an underling, and they said it was never implemented. While this assurance is welcome, the fact that such a proposal was even considered raises very serious privacy concerns.

My amendment would prohibit any funds from being used to collect or retain information about individuals attending gun shows by means of an automatic license plate reader. This

amendment is supported by the NRA, the National Rifle Association; the Gun Owners of America; and the ACLU.

Automatic license plate readers should not be used to target law-abiding citizens who are engaged in their constitutionally protected rights. Without strong regulations and greater transparency, this new technology would only increase the threat of illegitimate government surveillance.

I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment in order to rein in the illegal surveillance of Americans and to send a clear message to agencies like the DEA and the ATF that automatic license plate readers must not be used to collect information during constitutionally protected activities.

This includes Second Amendment activities, like attending gun shows.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

That rule states in pertinent part: "An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law"

One of the provisions is that it "requires a new determination."

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, let me respond to that by saying that The Wall Street Journal published an article on January 27 of this year which quotes what the ACLU uncovered through a Freedom of Information Act request to the Department of Justice.

In pertinent part, this revelation that was obtained by the ACLU reads:

The DEA Phoenix Division Office is working closely with the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives on attacking the guns going to "blank"—that is redacted—and the gun shows to include programs-operations with license plate readers at the gun shows.

At least some agent or agents within the DEA's Phoenix region believed that they had the authority to go to gun shows and use automatic license plate recognition technology to, basically, throw out a dragnet and take in the identities of everyone who was attending a constitutionally protected activity.

That is what this amendment attacks. At least some elements within the DEA thought that they had this authority. They thought they had this power.

I don't think this is creating any new legislation, because it is going after a power they believed they already had and believed that they had the ability to exercise.

So the withdrawal of funding to something they thought they had the

power to do is not creating a new oversight or provision. I forget the word the gentleman used. It is not legislating in the sense of giving them a power they didn't already have. They thought they had this power. This amendment would withdraw the funding for that.

I would urge the Chair to reject the point of order raised by the opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order? If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair finds that this amendment includes language requiring a new determination by the relevant Federal officials of whether an individual is attending a gun show. The gentleman from Colorado has not proven that this determination is required by existing law.

The amendment, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained, and the amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SANFORD

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. _____. Each amount made available by this Act (other than an amount required to be made available by a provision of law) is hereby reduced by 2.48 percent.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from South Carolina and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple and straightforward amendment, as has been laid out, which is to, in essence, make an across-the-board cut of this particular appropriation by 2.48 percent.

I think it is important to do so simply for this reason. I was in a Budget hearing this morning, and the new Director of the Congressional Budget Office came by.

In his testimony, what he talked about was the way in which the American civilization and the Federal budget was nearing a tipping point beyond which there would be substantial consequence to that which we can budget here at the Federal level; to the value of the dollar; to future interest rates; and, ultimately, to the American way of life.

□ 1615

I think what is interesting is that, indeed, Admiral Mike Mullen, a military man, observed the same, because when he was asked what is the biggest threat to the American way of life and to American security, his answer was the American debt.

You can look at a long list of different authors who have talked about this theme in different ways. You

know, Reinhart and Rogoff talked about it in their book entitled, "This Time is Different," wherein, again, you look at economies that get to around 90 percent debt to GDP and, frankly, the wheels start to come off. Bad things begin to happen both to the economy and to the government's ability to perpetuate funding for programs that are important.

We have gone through a long list of well-discussed programs within this particular appropriation bill that are important, but for our government's ability to sustain those programs, we need to look beyond 10 or 15 years out. We need to look at the long run, and ultimately that is what this bill is about.

I think it is interesting from a non-partisan standpoint that Erskine Bowles and Alan Simpson said, if you look at our financial picture, it is the most predictable financial collapse or calamity in the history of man. I could go through a lot of other reasons numerically as to why I think it is important, but the short answer is we are nearing that tipping point that was talked about in the Budget hearing this morning.

I see my colleague standing, so I will reserve the balance of my time and come back to a few other points in a moment.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to across-the-board cuts.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I respect the gentleman's presentation, but I think we ought to put it in full context. We do have an across-the-board cut. It is a huge cut. It is called sequestration. Although Admiral Mullen did admonish the Congress for the fact that we were running a deficit and it was a threat to our national security, he also opposed sequestration, across-the-board cuts.

I think the problem is—and this bill certainly is an across-the-board cut from what we used to spend, with the exception of the protection of one program, but I oppose this. We are on the Committee on Appropriations. We try to go through these things with a fine-tooth comb to figure out how to adjust the spending of the United States of America. The worst thing you can do is just do an across-the-board cut because that harms good programs, and you aren't necessarily cutting enough to really make a big dent in the national debt.

Frankly, the spending of America has come down quite dramatically, and the economy has improved, and our national debt is, in the recent years, at an all-time low. I think, frankly, we in Congress talk about this debt but don't put it into context.

I like to put it in the context that I talk to my constituents about that what we have at the national level, just like you have at the local level and your own personal life, you have

sort of two debts. You have a short-term debt, which is that credit card, you spent too much that one month, so you are going to pay it slowly off in the next couple months. That is the annual deficit.

The long-term debt is that big mortgage that we have on our houses. We don't panic because of a mortgage. We made an agreement over a period of time—15, 30 years—that we are going to pay off this mortgage, and we know what those payments will be.

Wall Street doesn't worry about a deficit when we have a plan to pay it off. Wall Street worries about when we take a meat-ax approach to not running the government efficiently, not having enough people to process people when they need permits and they need access to licenses and things like that.

So I wish Congress would get off this sort of let's just use a meat-ax approach to solving these problems because we won't spend the time to get into the weeds. And although I respect the gentleman and his approach, I just don't think this is the proper way to do it, and I would oppose the across-the-board cut.

Mr. CULBERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARR. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to join in opposition to this amendment. I share my colleague's concern about government spending, but two-thirds of the problem is in Social Security and Medicare and Medicaid, and in ObamaCare, the national debt, the interest on the debt. That is what is drowning us.

We, in the appropriations process, handle about a third of Federal spending, and we have cut spending here in this bill. We have limited resources; and as chairman of the subcommittee, we have prioritized that money to go, first and foremost, to law enforcement.

The gentleman's amendment would cut \$683 million out of Federal law enforcement, which is something I just simply cannot support. The gentleman's amendment would cut \$212 million out of the FBI and just eviscerate their ability to deal with cyber espionage and to deal with terrorism. The gentleman's amendment would cut \$450 million from NASA, essentially crippling our efforts to get Americans back into space on an American-made rocket, something we simply have to do as quickly as possible.

We have in our bill prioritized the limited, very precious, and scarce, hard-earned tax dollars that our constituents have entrusted us with and made sure that Federal law enforcement is taken care of, scientific research is protected, NASA is protected. But first and foremost, we protected public safety with the way we have prioritized our spending.

I have to urge Members to oppose this amendment because we have already followed the Dave Ramsey approach in spending money where it is

most needed. We have got to focus on the two-thirds of the problem that is drowning us: the mandatory, automatic spending programs—Medicare, Social Security, Medicaid—that are drowning this economy. That is where the deficit and the debt is coming from. While we continue to do our part in Appropriations on the one-third that we have got control over, we are continuing to cut and prioritize, let's focus on the two-thirds that is actually hurting the American economy. I would urge Members to oppose this amendment and defeat it.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FATTAH. It is good to see my good friend on the floor. I, unfortunately, can't support his amendment, but I appreciate his work here in the Congress.

In the past, unlike those rhetorically who offer notions of support for Simpson-Bowles, I actually supported it and voted for it. I am the only Member of the House that has offered a bill to get rid of the income tax and pay our debts.

I wanted to set up a consumption tax, which 150 other countries in the world use. We have got a consumption-based economy. It might be a good notion to find our revenues where the action is.

I don't take a backseat to anyone when it comes to fiscal responsibility, but unless we have a global budget deal, it is going to be impossible for us to manage the accounts of what you agree are very important Federal agencies that have very important responsibilities.

We are running the most important, the most powerful country in the world. We can't do it on the cheap and be number one. China builds 100 science-only universities in 5 years. It would take us 20 years to build one. We don't have the same kind of decision-making process, obviously, and it takes us a while to formulate our decision package; but even when we get there, we have this debate about whether or not we are going to stand up and be the leading country in the world, whether in space exploration or in any of the areas of scientific enterprise in which we have always had the absolute lead. Now we have only a relative lead.

There are those who are working in ways that are adverse to insisting on America being number one. Those are people who want to tell the American public that we can continue to have the best military in the world and not pay for it or the best education system and not pay for it. Or you look at our national laboratories, and I have visited Oak Ridge, I have visited Los Alamos and Sandia and Fermi and Argonne. You look at these laboratories. These were major investments. Now, some might call it spending, but it

helped America win wars, but also win the economic fight against our competitors by making these investments.

I just think that it is not a matter of what we can cut. It is where does our country want to end up. Do we want to be something less than number one in the world? Is that the legacy we want to leave our children and grandchildren? Or are we going to make the decisions that others before us have made, which is that we have to make tough decisions, and we are going to have to carry our own pail of water up the hill, and we are going to have to pay for all that we get. It was Abraham Lincoln who said you may not get all that you pay for, but you will pay for all that you get.

So this notion that somehow America can be number one on the cheap, I am not buying it. The world's not going to buy it. We are competing with countries that have a billion-plus population. They are making investments, and they want to eat our lunch, economically. There may be challenges in other ways for our country down the road, and we have to be prepared as leaders to make some tough decisions and to tell the American public that, in order to retain our position, we might have to actually stand up to the bar and pay our fair share.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I admire the earnestness of my colleagues who, in good faith, are pressing forward in terms of trying to protect a whole host of programs that I think we all recognize are of great importance to the American people.

Churchill once observed that the beauty of the American political system was that it always did the right thing—after it had exhausted every other possible remedy. My fear in this is, if we wait late in the game, and this is exactly what the Budget Director was talking about this morning, if we wait, the consequences to waiting, in numerical terms, become horrific. We are dealing with a math trap that compounds with time. Einstein, in fact, was once asked what is the most powerful force in the universe, and his reply was compound interest. The numbers become, I think, absolutely compelling.

So I would agree with my colleagues that across-the-board cuts are absolutely not the best way to go. When I was involved in State politics, I worked earnestly against across-the-board cuts. It is only out of desperation that I offer a proposal that entails across-the-board cuts because, again, if we wait, what the Budget Director this morning says was that there will be real consequences.

I would make four additional points:

One, if we are serious about addressing the entitlement problem, then we shouldn't be borrowing from entitlement spending to fund mandatory spending, and that is exactly what this particular appropriation bill does to the tune of about \$10 billion. So I think

that if we are really going to get earnest about entitlement spending, this would be a place to start, which is part of the reason as to why we focused on this particular appropriation bill.

Two, my colleague from California mentioned national debt is at an all-time low. That is incorrect. In fact, we are at an all-time high if you look at the numbers. Roughly, it took us 200 years to get to \$5 trillion in debt. Over the Bush administration, we went from 5 to 10. It doubled. And now, during the Obama administration, it is going to double again from roughly 10 to 20. It is at an all-time high.

I think the key to a mortgage is your ability to pay it off. It is not, again, is there a mortgage or isn't there. It is can you pay it off. If you look at the numbers—and increasingly rating agencies around the world have suggested that when you get up around that 90 percent number, there is less and less probability that you will be able to perpetuate that spending, which goes to the heart of can we perpetuate our ability to fund these worthwhile programs, which is what this amendment is about.

Lastly, I would say Admiral Mullen, when he spoke against the sequester, he did so, in large measure, because what he recognized was the way in which sequester disproportionately impacted the military.

For a host of reasons, again, I would ask support for this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANDFORD).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used with respect to the case *State of Texas, et al. v. United States of America, et al.* (No. B-14-254 in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas and No. 15-40238 in the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Iowa and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

□ 1630

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is an amendment, in

short form, that says that none of the funds made available by this act may be used with respect to the case *State of Texas, et al. v. United States of America.*

I point out to the body, Mr. Chairman, that that is the case that was filed by then-Attorney General of Texas Greg Abbott, now Governor of Texas, to protect the interest of Texans. It has been signed on to now by 25 States, I believe. And this is in reference to the President's November 20 DAPA policy, his executive amnesty policy.

We have watched as this Congress has three times voted to reject the President's initiative, and the debate has been centered on constitutional grounds. The position of this Congress has three times been that the President of the United States is the leader of the executive branch of this government, and the legislative powers are all vested here in the United States Congress, in a House and in a Senate. That is article 1 of the Constitution.

That is what the President taught through his 10 years as an adjunct professor of constitutional law at the University of Chicago, and that is what he also uttered at least 22 times as President of the United States—that he didn't have the authority to establish in advance an executive amnesty that would waive the application of the law for some 5 million people.

Not only does this Congress agree with the President's 22 statements that he has since changed his position on—by the way, the President has a 33-page Office of Legal Counsel opinion that is written, I think, very loosely—and I read every word of that—but the President's convictions, I believe, were reflected prior to this political decision.

And so my amendment prohibits any of the funds from being used to further defend this unconstitutional executive amnesty position.

Mr. Chairman, I would point out that not only has Congress voted three times but also the President's 22 statements, as I said, and then it is backed up by Federal Judge Hanen, who ruled on the side of the Constitution and the rule of law and the separation of powers. And on the administration's appeal, a three-judge panel in the Fifth Circuit also ruled and indicated that the State of Texas and the other co-plaintiffs were likely to prevail, and granted standing to the State of Texas.

And now we have an administration that appears to be willing to continue this debate further and go with an appeal to the Circuit Court again. They actually have the opportunity to go directly to the Supreme Court.

So, Mr. Chairman, I go through this long list of things that have happened because a lot of money has been spent and wasted in an attempt to, let's say—the gracious way to say it would be to stretch the Constitution beyond any bounds that it had been stretched before.

This amendment simply directs that none of the funds made available shall be used to continue that endeavor.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FATTAH. So when the gentleman references the Congress acting three times, when you say "the Congress," do you mean both Houses of the Congress? Or, are you referring to one House?

Mr. KING of Iowa. I would have to go back and look at the record in the Senate to give you an accurate count. I can tell you that it is an accurate count for the House. It may not be a full three times in the Senate.

Mr. FATTAH. I thank the gentleman, and if he would continue to yield, we can continue for one second. Because I know that you appreciate the construction of our government and the way the Constitution framed it. It is not the law of the land that one House acts on something. We need the House to act, the Senate to act, and then we need a Presidential signature or an override by a Presidential veto.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, and thanking the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his insight, Mr. Chairman, I would state that the Constitution is very clear. It was very clear to the President of the United States for 10 years while he taught it, and it was very clear when he made his statements 22 times.

So this is the Congress reasserting itself. Our Founding Fathers expected we would do that.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. I rise in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FATTAH. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time in that colloquy. I look forward to being able to do the same in return, but I do appreciate the opportunity to communicate with my colleague, because I don't want anyone to misinterpret the facts here.

Every single President has acted in this area. And these actions by this President are no different than the actions by previous Presidents in this trade space around providing amnesty.

And what the gentleman strenuously and sincerely objects to is that this has benefited a large number of people whom the President has a different view of, in terms of their circumstances, because they were brought here as young children. And the President says, well, they are here, they went to school here, and this is the only country they know, and they have abided by our laws, and he is granting them this ability to stay. And the gentleman objects.

But I don't want anyone to think that the Congress has taken some different view, because the Congress is

two Houses—the House and the Senate—and even if both Houses were to act, the way our laws are structured, you need a Presidential signature.

So, in fact, one House may have a difference of opinion. When Ronald Reagan was President, the Democrats had a difference of opinion. It didn't change the law so that we voted in some particular way.

I don't want anyone to misinterpret the comments of my colleague as he has articulated his sincere objections to these issues.

And then to get to the point of his amendment, what he is saying is that it is wonderful that the judiciary is responding, they are interpreting the law the way he thinks it should be interpreted, but here what he wants to do is to deny the executive branch appropriate resources to pursue its policy objectives by saying that none of the funds here can be used by DOJ in furtherance of their position.

So I think it is fair for the House to have a view. The House is even suing the President about his point of view on some things. But it is unfair for us to deny the executive branch an opportunity to put forth its arguments in court on any of these matters so that we can get a proper ruling from the third branch of our government.

And even though there have been rulings in the gentleman's favor, he and I both know that we are not at the final rendezvous here, and that the wheels of justice grind slowly, but there will be a final decision probably by the highest court in the land. But we should not deny the DOJ an opportunity to go into court and argue the administration's position. I think that would be unfair.

Therefore, I oppose this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak in support of the amendment. I strongly support Mr. KING's amendment because what the President has done is clearly illegal.

The President does not have the ability to change the law by himself. As my good friend from Philadelphia points out, one House of Congress cannot change the law all by itself. And similarly, the Chief Executive cannot change the law enacted by Congress and signed by the President all by himself.

The law is very clear that people who are in the country illegally, who have violated the immigration laws of the United States, need to be deported. And the President by this illegal executive action has attempted to override the Federal law enacted by Congress and signed by previous Presidents.

The District Court agreed that President Obama's action is illegal and that an injunction lies against it. The District Court suspended the President's executive order because it was illegal. The Federal Court of Appeals in New

Orleans suspended the President's executive order because it was illegal. We expect the full Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals to suspend the President's executive order because it is illegal. We expect the Supreme Court to suspend the President's order because it is illegal, because the Constitution clearly says that as chief executive you have an obligation to faithfully execute the laws of the United States.

You cannot make a law all by yourself with the stroke of a pen. And that is exactly what President Obama has done. In addition, it has placed an incredibly unaffordable financial burden on the people of Texas, the people of Tennessee, and the people of all the States of the Union that would have to deal with these folks that are here illegally.

All that we ask is that the law be enforced. All that we ask is that the law be respected, because, as our Founding Fathers understood, the law is the foundation of all of our liberty. Without law enforcement, there can be no liberty. Because there is just simply anarchy. If you look at northern Mexico today, it is in a complete state of anarchy. Mexico is essentially a failed state because they have no law enforcement.

In the United States of America we cannot expect to preserve this great Republic handed down to us by our Founders without enforcing the law. The fundamental question that this lawsuit, *Texas v. United States*, is pursuing—and winning—is respect for the rule of law as the foundation for all our liberties.

So I strongly support Mr. KING's amendment as an important tool in the ongoing effort to overturn the President's illegal executive amnesty. We expect the Supreme Court will stand behind the State of Texas and agree that the President's order must be suspended because it is illegal, because without law enforcement, without respect for the law, there can be no liberty. That is the issue here.

I strongly support the gentleman's amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I would just reiterate that the President of the United States has signed a document. It is a November 20 document that says that he is going to impose executive amnesty. This House disagrees. Many in the Senate also disagree.

They have been chasing down an expensive rabbit trail to advance an operation of imposing amnesty in the United States of America, in contravention of our laws.

This Congress is reserved the right by the Constitution to write immigration law, and our Founding Fathers imagined we would jealously guard that power. That is what this amendment is about.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I think that we are at a point where it is difficult to reconcile what we are trying

to do here—that is, in an appropriations bill—with these policy riders.

Now, I have heard my chairman claim that the President of the United States has done things that are illegal three or four times. I think that that kind of language is not useful in the debate, nor is it factual, because I think that the President has been acting well in concert with the precedents of former Presidents who have provided clemency and amnesty.

And I have heard Members like Mr. KING criticize those other Presidents who have provided amnesty, like Ronald Reagan and others, and I have never heard anyone claim that President Reagan acted illegally in those matters. So I find it unusual that we would be in this type of circumstance.

I heard the chairman run through a litany in which he also has the Supreme Court finally make some decision, which they have obviously not done yet.

So I would like to try to get back on the tracks of moving an appropriations bill. And the point that we have to understand here is that, if we are a coequal branch of the government—that is, the President is coequal to us, but we are one-half of the Congress—then the idea that what the House says goes is nonsensical.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FATTAH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would just make the point that this Congress passed an amnesty act in 1986, and Ronald Reagan signed that. It was an act of Congress that brought amnesty in 1986. I think it was a mistake, but I believe it was constitutional.

Mr. FATTAH. Reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman's point.

Like I was saying, it is nonsensical to assume that whatever the unfettered action of the House is, that it, number one, represents the action of the Congress, because it doesn't. We have two Houses. We have a Senate and a House. And then we are coequal to the President, but the President has certain rights provided to him under the Constitution.

If you find no exception in the actions of other Presidents, it is unusual that we would have such enthusiastic language in condemnation of this President's very similar actions.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa will be postponed.

□ 1645

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. __. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to negotiate or finalize a trade agreement that includes provisions relating to visas issued under section 101(a)(15) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)). The limitation described in this section shall not apply in the case of the administration of a tax or tariff.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Iowa and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, this amendment addresses the circumstances around the trade promotion authority and later on, perhaps, the Trans-Pacific Partnership, but it also addresses any of our trade negotiations that might take place that would be funded under this bill.

The rationale is that there has been much concern about the negotiations with regard to trade promotion authority in particular, enabling the discussion about immigration visas as being part of the trade negotiations.

It is a longstanding pattern and practice of this Congress to assert our constitutional authority over immigration visas. When our U.S. Trade Representative or other negotiators bring in negotiations that have to do with visas, it complicates our trade negotiations and puts us in a place where, when we see a trade agreement come before us, perhaps it is under a trade promotion authority that would be negotiated and this House votes on it, then it may well have within it visa agreements that have been negotiated with the multiple countries and taking out of the hands of Congress the ability to directly establish, although there is an indirect inference, but directly establish our immigration policy.

A lot of the opposition to the trade negotiations that have been taking place in the Trans-Pacific Partnership have been about concerns of news reports that have come from places like Australia that have pointed out that there are negotiations going on that have to do with visas.

There was a circumstance several years ago, under a previous administration, where they had negotiated immigration provisions in a trade agreement, and even though it was a non-amendable trade agreement, we went before the Judiciary Committee and had a full hearing. I offered two amendments that passed, and ultimately, there were changes made in that agreement. There is a long history on this with me.

It has been an important issue to maintain the separation of immigra-

tion policy and the Congress from the executive branch negotiations in trade. That is what this amendment does. It says no immigrant visas will be negotiated in trade agreements. That means all of them.

Again, the Constitution enumerates this power to the Congress, not the executive branch. I urge its adoption.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FATTAH. I think that the hopes of having some bipartisan support for this bill is waning. I think it is very unfortunate that we are now at a point where we are trying to intrude in an entirely different area of the President's prerogatives. He can negotiate all he wants.

Now, I may not support what he negotiates, but to say you can't even discuss something in a negotiation, I think, is unfortunate.

I am in opposition, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I would reiterate this point, that this Congress and a lot of the American people lack confidence in the negotiations of our President. A lot of this angst has flowed forth from the Iranian negotiations and their march towards a nuclear capability that has undermined his credibility and made it significantly more difficult for a Congress that is in favor of trade, especially on my side of the aisle.

I am a natural-born free trader. I have always believed that I can compete with anybody in the world, and I think America and American companies can compete with anyone in the world. I think that we need to have a level playing field.

What is happening is that lack of confidence in the President's negotiations and the willingness to, I believe, give away some of the positions that would better enhance our national security with regard to Iran, in particular, has made it far more difficult for those like me, who are pro-free trade, pro-smart trade, and because of that and the discussions about immigration visas being part of the negotiations and the indications from other countries that that is taking place, the secrecy around these negotiations is another component of it.

When we have to go into a secure room and give up our iPhone and leave our notes there in order to be able to see what the administration will present us as far as these negotiations are concerned, it is hard to have confidence that we are getting all of the straight story.

This is a way to put some containment around the negotiations. If the

administration says there are no visas being negotiated, there should be no reason to oppose this amendment. That is really the bottom line.

If the administration opposes my amendment, that is a strong indication that they are not giving us the full story, but we are getting more of the full story from places like Australia.

I urge the adoption of my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the time remaining, please?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa has 45 seconds remaining.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time here and reiterate that this amendment addresses a lack of trust that these trade negotiations are focused on the things that trades are supposed to be discussed about.

I have a strong suspicion that they have included immigration visas in their trade agreements. This amendment is drafted consistent with the position of this Congress that immigration should not be part of trade negotiations.

If the administration says that it is not part of trade negotiations, they should say, Fine, I am happy to support the King amendment; and they will be happy to prove it in that fashion.

Meanwhile, a lot of us are not going to a secure room to see if there is anything in there, and we won't know what is presented to the this Congress until it is too late to resist.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, let me assure the House I have no intention of taking 4½ minutes to make the comments that I intend to make.

I was at SelectUSA, which is a gathering of people that the administration has brought together from around the world who were businesspeople and about investments in America. I was there with a number of Members of the U.S. Senate, Senator NELSON and others.

I got a chance at the lunch to sit next to a gentleman who has businesses in the United States—manufacturing businesses—and in South Africa and his home country in Asia and a number of other places.

He was saying that, when he travels to America, even though he has got 3,000 employees here, it is almost impossible for him to get the kind of visas and to get back and forth post-9/11 that can make it an efficient business trip for him. It requires such advance planning and so on.

I could imagine, in a negotiation, that there could be some consideration when there is a person who has got a multinational business and is employing Americans in Iowa or some other

State about their entry and exit from our country. In fact, he indicated that, in these other countries, he has such arrangements, just not in our own. I think that America has got to think about where it is on these issues.

This is not the appropriate bill for this. This is a bill to determine the appropriation levels that we are going to fund in certain accounts. We are well off the tracks, and I hope that we vote this amendment down. I am opposed to it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act under the heading "Department of Justice—Office of Justice Programs—State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance" may be used in contravention of section 642(a) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1373(a)).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Iowa and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, my amendment eliminates the funding that might be used in contravention of section 642(a) that is designated in the amendment.

642(a) is the section in the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996, as I know it, that prohibits the political subdivisions in America from establishing sanctuary policies we often refer to as sanctuary cities. These are the political subdivisions that establish a policy that prohibit their law enforcement officers and their other agents from cooperating with Federal immigration officials.

It seems illogical to me to think that any local government would want to prohibit their law enforcement officers from assisting in, cooperating with, and transferring information to the Federal law enforcement officers who are enforcing immigration law.

That section, it reads, in part, but with the thought being contained here: "Notwithstanding," the language says, "the political subdivisions may not prohibit, or in any way restrict any

government entity or official from sending to or receiving from the INS"—at the time, that is ICE today—"information regarding the citizenship or immigration status, lawful or unlawful, of any individual."

Mr. Chairman, I grew up in a law enforcement family. I looked at the men around me as a little boy, and I just thought that all adult men put on a uniform of some kind or another. I was steeped in respect for the supreme law of the land—the Constitution—and the rule of law.

When there was an issue that came forward, whether it was a bank robbery or some tragedy that took place, all levels of law enforcement cooperated with all other levels of law enforcement. No one that was a member of the city police said: I am not going to be serving papers here because that is the county's job.

No county deputy decided that he wouldn't pull somebody over for speeding because that was the city speed limit on a city street. No highway patrol officer decided that he wouldn't enforce local law.

No one that came in from the Division of Criminal Investigation or the FBI decided that it was their bailiwick, that it was exclusively their law to enforce and that no one should help them with that.

Law enforcement, to be effective, has to be a cooperation from all levels; and, of course, the public has to respect the rule of law; and they have to respect those who are there to protect and serve and to also enforce that law.

For me, I cannot understand how or why a city would establish these policies, but they are doing so. In the process of that, they are undermining the rule of law and eroding the respect for the rule of law and leaving their citizens vulnerable, when we could be helping them with Federal officers who need to get this information.

This is an amendment that has been offered in multiple years. It has passed this House multiple times. The number that I saw last year with the identical language passed the House by a vote of 214-94.

We have been consistent in defending the rule of law. This amendment says that no funds shall go to these political subdivisions from this bill, if they establish sanctuary city policies, to put it in short summation.

I urge its adoption, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1700

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Chairman, the description of the amendment, as we understand it, prohibits the use of these funds that contravene section 642 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996.

The facts are that the States and localities around the country that have

adopted laws and policies to limit immigration enforcement by law enforcement are focused on protecting public safety. We have this in California. We have it in many border States. There is a level of cooperation that does take place between local law enforcement agencies as well as our Federal enforcement officers.

Surely, we don't believe it is good public policy to force an unwanted role upon police through the threat of sanctions, which is what this amendment does, or withholding police funding. Frankly, if you believe in Federalism and if you believe in that relationship between local, State, and Federal Government, this is really top-down and I think runs contrary to the notion that law enforcement agencies at all levels collaborate and cooperate.

Holding this sort of a sword of Damocles, so to speak, over the head of local law enforcement agencies simply, I think, is not good public policy.

In an op-ed piece that was published in Roll Call last year, the police chief of Dayton, Ohio, explained why his department instructs its officers not to check the immigration status of witnesses and victims or to question their status in minor traffic stops.

He says:

These policies allow us to focus our limited resources on our primary mission, which is crime solving and community safety.

We know that local law enforcement agencies are clearly stretched very thin across the country. They also said victims of crimes should never be afraid to reach out for help due to the fear of immigration consequences because, notwithstanding the fact of their status, crimes are perpetrated upon these people as well.

Since Dayton adopted these policies and innovative ways of addressing crime problems, their crime rates have significantly declined; and, in the past 3 years, serious crime has declined nearly 22 percent, while serious property crime has gone down 15 percent. It is simply, we believe, perverse to punish communities that want to prioritize because they know best what their challenges are within their communities to protect the public against crime and to enact community-based policing activities. To deny them this funding through this threat of the SCAAP funds simply is, we believe, inappropriate.

Finally, I think that this amendment focuses on a problem that doesn't exist.

With those statements, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word to speak in support of the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, the objection of the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA) to this amendment is that he does not believe current Federal law is good public policy. As a Member of Congress, he has the privilege of filing amendments and filing

legislation to change current Federal legislation, but we cannot, as lawmakers, encourage law breaking.

All the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) says is that if a local or State government expects to receive Federal money, they should comply with Federal law. It is really that simple.

Mr. KING's amendment simply says that, if you expect to receive funding from the Department of Justice, if you expect to receive funding under the SCAAP program—the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program—to compensate local jurisdictions for housing illegal aliens who have broken State law and are housed in a State or local jail at local taxpayer expense, if you want to be compensated for that and if you want to apply for grant funding from the Department of Justice, all Mr. KING's amendment says is follow Federal law. If you want Federal money, follow Federal law.

The Federal law is very clear. The law Mr. KING is referencing here is very simple. It simply says that a State or local government may not prohibit or in any way restrict a government entity or official from sending or receiving any information regarding the citizenship or immigration status of any individual to the Immigration Services. That is all this law says.

It is a very important piece of law because, as the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) quite correctly points out, we expect all our local and State and Federal law enforcement officials to work together seamlessly.

Because we are a Nation of laws, we understand that all our liberty depends on the enforcement of the law, with equal protection and due process for everyone. All our liberties depend on local, State, and Federal law enforcement officers using their good hearts, their good sense, and their ability, as law enforcement officers, to recognize when and where they need to cooperate and communicate with the State law enforcement officials, with Federal law enforcement officials to protect the life and liberty of the people of the United States. That is what is really at stake here.

That is the objection that we have had to the President's unlawful actions. That is the concern and the objection we have in the State of Texas to the uncontrolled flow of people and drugs and guns and illegal material across the border. Our concern is not with the lawful free flow of people back and forth over the Rio Grande River. Our concern is with the illegal, criminal conduct.

We recognize in Texas the importance of free trade with Mexico and with Canada, but you cannot have free trade and a strong economy without safe streets, and you cannot have safe streets until the law is enforced. We in Texas, first and foremost, recognize that, in order to have that good relationship with Mexico, the law has got to be enforced.

We need workers from Mexico to come here lawfully. We need our laws to be respected so that we can ensure the economy stays strong, so that our liberty is protected. Our liberty can only be safe when the law is enforced.

All Mr. KING's amendment says is, if you expect to receive Federal money, follow Federal law. It is not complicated. That is very, very simple. Under the law that has been on the books since 1996, a State or local unit of government cannot restrict in any way the ability of a government official to either send information to Immigration Services or receive information from Federal immigration regarding the citizenship or unlawful status of any individual.

If my colleague from California (Mr. COSTA) objects to that law, it is his privilege, as a Member of Congress, to file an amendment or file legislation to amend it or change it. In the meantime, our responsibility as lawmakers and my responsibility as chairman of the Commerce, Justice, Science Subcommittee is to ensure that the law is enforced.

If agencies of the Federal Government or State or local governments expect to receive Federal money, if they expect to have the privilege of spending our constituents' hard-earned tax dollars, they should expect to follow the law.

If you want Federal money, follow Federal law. It is that simple. That is all Mr. KING's amendment does, and I urge Members to support it.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I want to reiterate the positions that were taken by the gentleman from Texas. We have political subdivisions, primarily, as sanctuary cities that are violating Federal law, and all we are saying is follow the law.

The point hasn't been made here that the Department of Justice could enforce this law, but they choose not to, and that empowers the political subdivisions, particularly the cities that continue to advance these sanctuary policies.

Can you imagine being a police officer and being told that, if you pick up people who are unlawfully present in America, that you can't tell the INS—even if you are having coffee with them—that you have got a jail full of people who are unlawfully present in America that are required by law to be placed into removal proceedings? That is just illogical.

I would point out that, if you disagree with this section of the code, you are here in this Congress, bring a bill to try to change it.

In the meanwhile, I am for full funding of the SCAAP funding. I think that, when we have people in the country and we are not enforcing immigration law, we should make sure that local jails are funded when they are picking up people that are unlawfully present in America.

I support the Byrne JAG grants. I want to give that to them, but we cannot

not do that under provisions if the local subdivisions are violating law.

Then with regard to the statement that this is a problem that doesn't exist—no, it is a problem that exists all over this country. It is growing. It is replete in city after city. We need to restore respect for the rule of law. That is what this amendment does. I urge its adoption.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LUETKEMEYER

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to carry out the program known as "Operation Choke Point".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from Missouri and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, question: How does the Federal Government get rid of an industry it doesn't like?

Answer: Simple, it cuts off that industry from the financial services sector.

Sounds impossible, doesn't it? However, that is exactly what the Department of Justice is doing in conjunction with the FDIC right now. Their name for this action is called Operation Choke Point. It is designed to force legally operating entities out of business by choking them off from the financial services they need to operate their businesses.

What started with nondepository lenders has spread to other industries, including pawn shops, tobacco retailers, and the firearms and ammunition industries, to name just a few, as well as the businesses that provide services and products to these industries.

This amendment would ensure that Operation Choke Point is ended and that the DOJ returns to their proper job, targeting companies based on fraudulent actions, not entire industries based on political motive. An identical amendment was offered by a bipartisan group of lawmakers during fiscal year 2015 debate, and it was passed by voice vote.

This isn't a partisan issue. This is an issue of DOJ abusing its authorities. I urge support for this amendment.

I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS).

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chair, soon, we will vote to end funding for a government program that is, at best, unethical and, at worst, illegal. The program known as Operation Choke Point forces banks to discriminate against legitimate, legal businesses.

Today, we know that banks are closing their customers' accounts under a directive by the U.S. Department of Justice. There is no appeals process.

That is right; the enforcer of the law of the land is backing this potentially unlawful program. Hard-working American businessowners are having their livelihoods ripped out from under them by a law established by this administration, not by Congress.

Operation Choke Point is another example of how the Obama administration has gone around Congress to create laws, rather than do their job to enforce the laws we already have on the books.

As a businessowner myself, Operation Choke Point worries me greatly. Operation Choke Point is un-American. It is deceiving and simply wrong. It is time this Congress uses its power of the purse to rein in government overreach and restore government accountability.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to defund Operation Choke Point.

In God we trust.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

□ 1715

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, now I think that there may be some mutuality of interest if what the gentleman says is true about what is at stake here. However, this is not a process in which we can discern all of that at this moment. This is an appropriations bill. I think that this is probably an area where the Congress should hold some hearings and look into it, take some testimony and figure out exactly what is going on before we would shut down what might be a very important program.

It may be, as the gentleman describes, that is something where DOJ is just moving in ways that make little or no sense. But I think that to come at the final point in the bill and seek to restrict DOJ in this way, I would be reluctant to support it, and therefore, I stand in opposition to it.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY).

Mr. MULVANEY. I thank my friend, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and I thank the chairman. What we are up here talking about is a program where the government is trying to put legal businesses out of business—that is what Operation

Choke Point is—legal businesses that some people don't like especially within the administration, pawnshops, payday lenders, ammunition manufacturers, gun shops, but legal businesses.

With all due respect to my friend from Pennsylvania, we have had hearings on this. In fact, the Department of Justice has claimed they have stopped this program. They have agreed with us that they shouldn't be doing this. Now, we don't believe they are actually doing that. We have indications from what is happening back in our districts that even though the Department of Justice says they have stopped Operation Choke Point, that it is still going on.

So here is my question, Mr. Chairman: Who supports this program? The Department of Justice says it is wrong. The Department of Justice says it is not even doing it. So who would get up here on this floor and say: "I think Operation Choke Point is a great idea. I think we should go ahead and continue to use means within the Department of Justice to drive legal businesses out of business"? I'm not really sure how you defend that position.

This is real for me in my district, Mr. Chairman. I have a woman-owned business in my home county who cannot get money to expand her pawnshop. I have businesses elsewhere in South Carolina that have a little tiny piece of their large financial services business in payday lending. They have been cut off from their financial relationships of 25 years. They can't get banking services. That is why the DOJ said they were going to stop. We just don't happen to believe them.

Mr. Chairman, we should support this amendment because it is the appropriate thing to do, to my good friend from Pennsylvania, because that is how we work. We defund programs that we don't like. And if the DOJ says they are not doing it anyway, what is the harm in voting for the amendment?

So I would ask again, who could possibly be against the amendment? Who could possibly be for Operation Choke Point?

I hope we have overwhelming and broad support for Mr. LUETKEMEYER's amendment later on this evening.

Mr. FATTAH. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER) for purposes of a colloquy.

Since the Republicans are in the majority, you have held hearings on this. Is there legislation that is coming forward to end these practices?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Yes. There have been hearings in the Financial Services Committee. There also have been hearings in the Oversight and Government Reform Committee. In fact, the Oversight and Government Reform Committee has an extensive report on both the DOJ and FDIC activities that include emails and internal memos from those agencies indicating these activities. They can't be denied.

They admit this in discussions with the FDIC. In a follow-up hearing to the report, they admit doing this. They have put in place a number of provisions of a bill that I am offering.

Mr. FATTAH. Let me restate my question.

Is there legislation coming forward that would end the practice?

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. That is what I was getting to.

As a result of these reports, we have come up with a bill. I have a bill filed. It will be coming up later on this month for a hearing in committee.

The FDIC has put in place many of the same provisions of the bill already as protocols for their operations on how they handle situations like this. I think we are making progress.

The problem is that DOJ has flipped the model of using FIRREA, which is a bank law that banks use to protect themselves against fraud, to now use that law against them. As a result, we need to stop that. That is part of the bill as well.

Mr. FATTAH. Reclaiming my time, I appreciate your answering my question.

So what I hear is that you held some hearings, that you have legislation, that you are making progress, and that the administration has already curtailed some of these practices that you are concerned about. However, you would still like to proceed with this prohibition of funds which might be entirely appropriate.

I don't have enough information, standing here today, to agree with you that that is the right thing to do, so I stand in opposition to the amendment even though I may not be, in spirit, in opposition to what it is that you are attempting to do. I just don't have enough information to join you in this effort as robustly as you are engaged in it.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. How much time do I have remaining, Mr. Chairman?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Missouri has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I just want to reiterate that I think my two other spokespeople here, with regards to this, have expressed concern.

There are businesses across this country that are being choked off from financial services, and as a result, they are doing legal business but yet not being able to do that business because of the actions of the FDIC and the DOJ, which the OGR report indicates that they are doing. They admit this wrongdoing in different committee hearings as well as meetings on campus here. What we are trying to do is protect legal businesses to be able to continue to do a legal business.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DENHAM

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to implement in the California Central Valley Recovery Domain any existing recovery plan for salmon and steelhead populations listed under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) as threatened species or endangered species if that recovery plan does not address predation by non-native species.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will help protect native salmon and steelhead species in California. My amendment would increase the effectiveness of recovery plans for species of salmon and steelhead listed under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 by ensuring an appropriate focus on predation control efforts.

Predation has long been recognized as a source of significant mortality for endangered and threatened species. In fact, according to NOAA, nonnative species are cited as a cause of endangerment for 48 percent of the species listed under the U.S. Endangered Species Act. This is especially true for marine species, and along the Pacific coast salmon and steelhead juveniles.

Recently, the National Marine Fisheries Service found protection of salmon and steelhead required “significantly reducing the nonnative predatory fishes,” and that reducing the number of nonnative predatory fishes was necessary to “prevent extinction or to prevent the species from declining irreversibly.”

In my own State, as far back as 1995, the State Water Resources Control Board recommended in its water quality control plan for the Bay Delta that the State and Federal fish agencies pursue programs to determine the impacts of predation by nonnative fish on salmon and steelhead. Unfortunately, despite such recognition, nothing has been done, and there are currently no programs in California to remove these nonnative predator fish.

Today in California, species such as the nonnative striped bass, introduced into California from New Jersey, consume up to 95 percent of the salmon and steelhead juveniles along the Sacramento and San Joaquin River System. These bass are not suppressed but, rather, managed by local State officials for abundance and sport fishing.

Mr. Chairman, predator control efforts can and do work. Currently, con-

trol of predator fish is being successfully used in a number of locations in North America. In the Great Lakes, control efforts of sea lamprey have reduced predation on lake trout, whitefish, salmon, rainbow trout, and others. In the Wood River System of Alaska, control of the arctic char reduced predation on sockeye salmon. In the Columbia and Snake Rivers, control of pike minnow reduced predation on salmon. In Cultus Lake, British Columbia, sockeye salmon increased after an eradication program focusing on pike minnow.

Recovering threatened and endangered salmon and steelhead populations has been a critical priority for Congress for years. This amendment simply ensures that controlling nonnative predators is a top priority for NOAA and all other stakeholders interested in maintaining healthy and sustainable salmon and steelhead populations.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment even though my opposition is not as apparent as it might otherwise be.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA), my great colleague here.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentlemen from California and from Pennsylvania for allowing me this time, and the gentleman from California for offering this important amendment.

Let me give a little perspective here. Clearly, everyone is aware of the disastrous drought that is having catastrophic impacts in California, not only in the San Joaquin Valley but throughout the State. There are a number of factors that have caused the challenges that we face with a lack of water in California. Obviously, it hasn't rained very much or snowed very much in the mountains for 4 years.

In addition to that, we have a broken water system in the sense that, designed in the fifties and the sixties, both the Federal and State water projects, for a State of 20 million people, today we have 38 million people, and we have a lot of demands not only for the use of agriculture, but for people in our cities and for the environment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment relates to our requirements under the law to protect the environment, those endangered species, salmonoid and steelhead that are native to California.

What happened is some 100 years ago, before we had a better understanding and before California was a much bigger State, there was the introduction of striped bass from the East Coast, bound from the Gulf of Saint Lawrence Seaway all the way down to Alabama.

These are native fish on the East Coast, but they were not native to California. They were introduced in a small number but became very successful in propagation, so much so that in the early 1900s, after 10 years of introduction, over 1 million pounds a year was being harvested of these nonnative striped bass fish in the San Francisco Bay-San Joaquin-Sacramento-Delta River systems.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. COSTA. As I was saying, Mr. Chairman, the fact is that the State has changed a great deal to present day. The current water system is unable to meet the demands under the current restrictions that are required under the Endangered Species Act to maintain and to try to increase the population of salmonoid and steelhead.

We have determined, as my colleague and friend from California stated, that these fish, these predator fish, are responsible for a large amount of the takings of both the native California salmon and steelhead, and yet we have no program to balance this.

What this amendment would do is it simply requires that for a recovery plan to be effective, it must incorporate and address all factors involved in species recovery, those of particularly high concern.

Some of the studies have indicated on the Sacramento River over 95 percent of the juvenile salmon and steelhead are eaten by these predator striped bass, these nonnative fish and other invasive species. This amendment ensures that the recovery plan for endangered salmon and steelhead takes these factors into account, including the predation by the nonnative species such as striped bass.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment of the gentleman from California.

□ 1730

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to point out one thing. Turlock Irrigation District, which is in my district, was forced to do a federally ordered study which actually showed, on the lower Tuolumne, 42,000 snook were killed by nonnative fish. This nearly eliminated the entire population. This is a federally ordered study.

With that, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California for offering this very important amendment.

When you look at what is going on in Central Valley, my hometown, and you hear stories—and I see for myself because I was there this past week—cities, houses, running out of water, wells

going dry. There was a news article a couple of days ago about a city in my district named Lemoore where wells are going dry that supply homes there the south side of town. That is a frustrating situation.

We fought for the last couple of years to bring legislation to the floor. We delivered it to the Senate a few times to help resolve this.

What makes this more frustrating than anything is we have got a situation here where we could actually make a difference. There are studies here that prove that 95 percent of the fish that we are trying to protect are being eaten by species that we are doing nothing about. The tools are there.

This is a simple amendment that actually helps deliver and force these agencies which should be looking out for the best interests of the people of the United States, it forces them to actually use every single tool in their toolbox to actually address the situation instead of wasting water.

When I saw the story not too long ago about water being diverted or released in these pulse flows to trick some of our species to try to protect instead of actually doing something to make a difference, it is a waste of water that could have made a real difference for the people in my district, people who are unemployed. We are starting to see unemployment numbers again upwards of 50 percent in some of these communities, houses where they are actually delivering water by truck so they can bathe. This is a real dire situation.

This amendment is a step in the right direction that actually allows these government agencies which, again, are supposed to take the interests of the American people at heart first to use all the tools in their toolbox.

This is a good idea, this is a good amendment, and this really truly makes a difference.

Again, thank you for this amendment, and I urge support.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

VACATING DEMAND FOR RECORDED VOTE ON
AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chair, an amendment was passed, King No. 077, and passed by a voice vote. I requested a recorded vote. I ask unanimous consent that my request for a recorded vote on

the amendment that it be withdrawn and allow the voice vote on which it passed to be the fact.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the request for a recorded vote is withdrawn. Accordingly, the ayes have it and the amendment is agreed to.

There was no objection.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FATTAH. We have arrived at our final moment in this bill where my colleague from New York, who is an extraordinary Member, has a very important amendment to offer.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JEFFRIES

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the monitoring or review of electronic communications between an inmate and attorney or attorney's agents who are traditionally covered by attorney-client privilege except as provided in 28 CFR 501.3(d).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 287, the gentleman from New York and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman, the ranking member from Pennsylvania, for his leadership.

This amendment would prohibit the use of funds in connection with the monitoring or review of electronic communications between an inmate detainee and his or her attorney or attorney's agents who are traditionally covered by the attorney-client privilege, except in circumstances where reasonable suspicion exists that a particular inmate's communications with attorneys or their agents may be designed to further or facilitate acts of terrorism.

This amendment is designed to protect the legally sacrosanct attorney-client privilege. It would protect the Sixth Amendment right to counsel of individuals who are using electronic communications to share privileged information with their designated court advocate.

The attorney-client privilege is one of the oldest recognized privileges in American jurisprudence. It is intended to encourage the full and frank communication between attorneys and their clients and thereby promote the broader public interests in the observance of the law and the administration of justice. It, of course, is anchored in the Sixth Amendment.

Currently, in-person attorney visitations in facilities that are run by the Bureau of Prisons can take place in attorney-client rooms which provide the privacy to share information necessary for a lawyer to adequately defend his or her client in court.

However, this is not the case for correspondence collected through electronic means. Waiver notices in Federal prisons vary from facility to facility, with some having clearly posted notices which state that by using the Trust Fund Limited Inmate Computer System, otherwise known as TRULINCS, inmates are waiving their privilege rights. Other facilities, however, provide no indication on the level of privacy that a detained individual can expect when using electronic prison resources.

The TRULINCS system also does not provide an option for a detained individual who hasn't been convicted to contact his or her attorney without subjecting electronic communications to external review.

The reading and collecting of privileged information in instances where clients are having electronic exchanges with their attorneys is a clear invasion of the traditional attorney-client privilege.

In this great country, there is a presumption of innocence, as one of our Founding Fathers, John Adams, has eloquently set forth. It is a foundational principle of our democracy.

It seems unreasonable to require in the 21st century that protection of the attorney-client privilege at a detention center only occurs through in-person visitation. These correctional facilities are often located in distant locations that cannot be easily accessed. We live in an era of modern technology and communication. The technology is available in these facilities, and our laws should reflect and adapt to the modern age.

This amendment would prohibit the prison system from compromising the attorney-client privilege, as anchored in the Sixth Amendment constitutional right to assistance of counsel.

For that reason, I urge my colleagues to support it, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I am not in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York is prepared to withdraw the amendment. We will work together to resolve this problem, so I do claim the time in opposition.

I think the gentleman from New York has raised a very valid concern. Certainly we do not want to see any exception to the attorney-client privilege. It can't be limited to just those circumstances where an attorney is actually present with the individual

interviewing him at the facility. I think the gentleman has identified a legitimate problem that we need to address.

As I discussed with Mr. JEFFRIES earlier, we got the language very late, and I want to be certain that we are not creating any unanticipated problems. Mr. JEFFRIES wants to be sure to exclude the very reasonable exception in current law that if a court order, on a finding of a judge, sees that there is potential or reasonable cause for concern that there may be furtherance of a terrorist plot in the course of those communications between an attorney and a client, the Department of Justice would have the right under that court order to listen to that conversation.

We want to make sure that we protect that exception but make sure we take care of the one he has identified, so if I could, with my colleague from Philadelphia Mr. JEFFRIES' help, we appreciate, as we just discussed earlier, if he would withdraw this amendment. I will work with my colleague Ranking Member FATTAH from Philadelphia to help address the concern you have got when we move to conference. I think it is a valid concern and one that we will work closely with you, sir, to resolve.

Mr. FATTAH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULBERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to concur with the chair's every utterance on this amendment that we will work together and help facilitate what I think is a very righteous effort on behalf of Congressman JEFFRIES to protect the rights of all Americans to have privileged conversations and interactions with their attorneys so that their rights can be fully protected.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time to hear from my colleague from New York for the purpose of completing the discussion.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas and the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania for their willingness to work together on this very important issue in terms of the preservation of the attorney-client privilege in the detainee context and look forward to working with the two of them and Members of this august body to resolve this issue.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment at this time.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment by Mr. MASSIE of Kentucky.

Amendment by Mr. MASSIE of Kentucky.

Amendment by Mr. MASSIE of Kentucky.

Amendment by Mr. FLORES of Texas.

Amendment by Mr. SANFORD of South Carolina.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. KING of Iowa.

Amendment by Mr. KING of Iowa.

Amendment by Mr. DENHAM of California.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MASSIE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 289, noes 132, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 288]

AYES—289

Aguilar	Cooper	Garrett
Amash	Costa	Gibson
Amodei	Costello (PA)	Goodlatte
Ashford	Courtney	Gowdy
Barr	Cramer	Graham
Bass	Crowley	Graves (GA)
Beatty	Cuellar	Graves (MO)
Becerra	Cummings	Grayson
Benish	Curbelo (FL)	Green, Al
Bera	Davis (CA)	Green, Gene
Beyer	Davis, Danny	Griffith
Bishop (GA)	Davis, Rodney	Grijalva
Bishop (UT)	DeFazio	Grothman
Blum	DeGette	Guthrie
Blumenauer	Delaney	Gutiérrez
Bonomici	DeLauro	Hahn
Boyle, Brendan	DelBene	Hanna
F.	Dent	Hardy
Brady (PA)	DeSantis	Harper
Brat	DeSaulnier	Hastings
Brooks (AL)	DesJarlais	Heck (NV)
Brown (FL)	Deutch	Heck (WA)
Brownley (CA)	Diaz-Balart	Herrera Beutler
Buck	Dingell	Hice, Jody B.
Bucshon	Doggett	Higgins
Butterfield	Dold	Himes
Capps	Donovan	Hinojosa
Capuano	Doyle, Michael	Honda
Cárdenas	F.	Hoyer
Carney	Duckworth	Huelskamp
Carson (IN)	Duffy	Huffman
Castor (FL)	Duncan (SC)	Hultgren
Castro (TX)	Duncan (TN)	Hunter
Chaffetz	Edwards	Hurt (VA)
Chu, Judy	Ellison	Israel
Cicilline	Ellmers (NC)	Issa
Clark (MA)	Emmer (MN)	Jeffries
Clarke (NY)	Engel	Jenkins (KS)
Clawson (FL)	Eshoo	Jenkins (WV)
Clay	Esty	Johnson, E. B.
Cleaver	Farr	Jolly
Clyburn	Fleischmann	Jones
Coffman	Fortenberry	Joyce
Cohen	Poster	Kaptur
Collins (GA)	Frankel (FL)	Katko
Collins (NY)	Fudge	Keating
Comstock	Gabbard	Kelly (IL)
Connolly	Gallego	Kennedy
Conyers	Garamendi	Kildee

Kilmer	Nadler	Simpson
Kind	Napolitano	Sires
King (NY)	Neal	Slaughter
Kinzinger (IL)	Newhouse	Smith (MO)
Kirkpatrick	Nolan	Smith (WA)
Kline	Norcross	Speier
Knight	O'Rourke	Stefanik
Kuster	Pallone	Stutzman
Labrador	Pascrell	Swalwell (CA)
Langevin	Paulsen	Takai
Larsen (WA)	Payne	Takano
Larson (CT)	Perlmutter	Thompson (CA)
Lawrence	Perry	Thompson (MS)
Lee	Peterson	Tipton
Levin	Pingree	Titus
Lewis	Pocan	Tonko
Lieu, Ted	Poe (TX)	Torres
Lipinski	Polis	Tsongas
LoBiondo	Price (NC)	Upton
Lofgren	Price, Tom	Valadao
Loudermilk	Quigley	Van Hollen
Love	Rangel	Vargas
Lowenthal	Reed	Veasey
Lowey	Ribble	Vela
Luetkemeyer	Rice (NY)	Velázquez
Lujan Grisham	Rice (SC)	Visclosky
(NM)	Richmond	Walden
Luján, Ben Ray	Rigell	Walker
(NM)	Rogers (AL)	Walorski
Lummis	Rohrabacher	Walz
Maloney,	Rokita	Wasserman
Carolyn	Ros-Lehtinen	Schultz
Maloney, Sean	Roybal-Allard	Waters, Maxine
Marchant	Royce	Watson Coleman
Massie	Ruppersberger	Welch
Matsui	Ryan (OH)	Wenstrup
McClintock	Ryan (WI)	Westmoreland
McDermott	Sanchez, Loretta	Whitfield
McGovern	Sanford	Williams
McNerney	Sarbanes	Wilson (FL)
McSally	Schakowsky	Woodall
Meeks	Schiff	Yarmuth
Meng	Schrader	Yoho
Messer	Schweikert	Young (AK)
Mooney (WV)	Scott (VA)	Young (IA)
Moore	Scott, David	Young (IN)
Moulton	Sensenbrenner	Zeldin
Mulvaney	Serrano	Zinke
Murphy (FL)	Sherman	
Murphy (PA)	Shimkus	

NOES—132

Abraham	Hartzler	Pittenger
Aderholt	Hensarling	Pitts
Allen	Hill	Poliquin
Babin	Holding	Pompeo
Barletta	Hudson	Posey
Barton	Huizenga (MI)	Ratcliffe
Bishop (MI)	Hurd (TX)	Reichert
Black	Johnson (OH)	Renacci
Blackburn	Johnson, Sam	Roby
Bost	Jordan	Rogers (KY)
Boustany	Kelly (PA)	Rooney (FL)
Brady (TX)	King (IA)	Roskam
Bridenstine	LaMalfa	Ross
Brooks (IN)	Lamborn	Rothfus
Buchanan	Lance	Rouzer
Burgess	Latta	Ruiz
Bustos	Loeb sack	Rush
Byrne	Long	Russell
Calvert	Lucas	Salmon
Carter (GA)	Lynch	Sánchez, Linda
Carter (TX)	MacArthur	T.
Chabot	Marino	Scalise
Cole	McCarthy	Scott, Austin
Conaway	McCaul	Sessions
Cook	McColum	Sewell (AL)
Crawford	McHenry	Shuster
Crenshaw	McKinley	Smith (NE)
Culberson	McMorris	Smith (NJ)
Denham	Rodgers	Smith (TX)
Farenthold	Meadows	Thompson (PA)
Fincher	Meehan	Thornberry
Fitzpatrick	Mica	Tiberi
Fleming	Miller (FL)	Trott
Flores	Miller (MI)	Turner
Forbes	Moolenaar	Wagner
Fox	Mullin	Walberg
Franks (AZ)	Neugebauer	Walters, Mimi
Frelinghuysen	Noem	Weber (TX)
Gibbs	Nunes	Webster (FL)
Gohmert	Olson	Westerman
Gosar	Palazzo	Wilson (SC)
Granger	Palmer	Wittman
Graves (LA)	Pearce	Womack
Guinta	Pelosi	Yoder
Harris	Peters	

NOT VOTING—11

Adams	Jackson Lee	Sinema
Bilirakis	Johnson (GA)	Stewart
Cartwright	Nugent	Stivers
Fattah	Roe (TN)	

□ 1812

Messrs. FORBES, CALVERT, LYNCH, SESSIONS, KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mrs. ROBY changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Ms. FUDGE, Messrs. DEUTCH, HASTINGS, ISRAEL, DANNY DAVIS of Illinois, GUTIERREZ, CLYBURN, ELLISON, HUFFMAN, Mses. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, MAXINE WATERS of California, and WASSERMAN SCHULTZ changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. SIMMS. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 288 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chair, During rollcall vote No. 288 on H.R. 2578, I mistakenly recorded my vote as “nay” when I should have voted “aye.”

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MCCARTHY was allowed to speak out of order.)

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Chair, I rise for the purpose of making an announcement.

Members are advised that no more votes are expected in the House tonight.

The House will begin debate on the fiscal year 2016 Transportation, Housing and Urban Development Appropriations bill immediately following this vote series. Debate will continue late tonight, so any Member wishing to offer an amendment should be prepared to do so at the appropriate point in the bill.

Our next votes are expected at approximately 11 a.m. tomorrow.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MASSIE

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. WESTMORELAND). Without objection, 2-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 250, noes 171, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 289]

AYES—250

Abraham	Graves (MO)	Pearce
Aderholt	Green, Gene	Perry
Allen	Griffith	Peterson
Amash	Grothman	Pittenger
Amodei	Guinta	Pitts
Ashford	Guthrie	Poe (TX)
Babin	Hanna	Poliquin
Barletta	Hardy	Polis
Barr	Harper	Pompeo
Barton	Harris	Posey
Benishek	Hartzler	Price, Tom
Bishop (MI)	Heck (NV)	Ratcliffe
Bishop (UT)	Hensarling	Reed
Black	Herrera Beutler	Reichert
Blackburn	Hice, Jody B.	Renacci
Blum	Hill	Ribble
Bost	Holding	Rice (SC)
Boustany	Hudson	Rigell
Brady (TX)	Huelskamp	Roby
Brat	Huizenga (MI)	Rogers (AL)
Bridenstine	Hultgren	Rogers (KY)
Brooks (AL)	Hunter	Rohrabacher
Brooks (IN)	Hurd (TX)	Rokita
Buchanan	Hurt (VA)	Rooney (FL)
Buck	Issa	Ros-Lehtinen
Bucshon	Jenkins (KS)	Roskam
Burgess	Jenkins (WV)	Ross
Bustos	Johnson (OH)	Rothfus
Byrne	Johnson, Sam	Rouzer
Calvert	Jolly	Royce
Carter (GA)	Jones	Russell
Carter (TX)	Jordan	Ryan (WI)
Chabot	Joyce	Salmon
Chaffetz	Katko	Sanford
Clawson (FL)	Kelly (PA)	Scalise
Coffman	Kind	Schrader
Cole	King (IA)	Schweikert
Collins (GA)	Kinzingler (IL)	Scott, Austin
Collins (NY)	Kirkpatrick	Sensenbrenner
Comstock	Kline	Sessions
Conaway	Knight	Shimkus
Cook	Labrador	Shuster
Cooper	LaMalfa	Simpson
Costello (PA)	Lamborn	Smith (MO)
Cramer	Lance	Smith (NE)
Crawford	Latta	Smith (NJ)
Crenshaw	LoBiondo	Smith (TX)
Cuellar	Long	Stefanik
Culberson	Loudermilk	Stivers
Curbelo (FL)	Love	Stutzman
Davis, Rodney	Lucas	Thompson (PA)
DeFazio	Luetkemeyer	Thornberry
Denham	Lummis	Tiberi
Dent	MacArthur	Tipton
DeSantis	Marchant	Trott
DesJarlais	Marino	Turner
Diaz-Balart	Massie	Upton
Dold	McCarthy	Valadao
Duffy	McCaul	Wagner
Duncan (SC)	McClintock	Walberg
Duncan (TN)	McHenry	Walden
Ellmers (NC)	McKinley	Walker
Emmer (MN)	McMorris	Walorski
Farenthold	Rodgers	Walters, Mimi
Fincher	McSally	Walz
Fitzpatrick	Meadows	Weber (TX)
Fleischmann	Meehan	Webster (FL)
Fleming	Messer	Wenstrup
Flores	Mica	Westerman
Forbes	Miller (FL)	Westmoreland
Fortenberry	Miller (MI)	Whitfield
Fox	Moolenaar	Williams
Franks (AZ)	Mooney (WV)	Wilson (SC)
Frelinghuysen	Mullin	Wittman
Garrett	Mulvaney	Womack
Gibbs	Murphy (PA)	Woodall
Gibson	Neugebauer	Yoder
Gohmert	Newhouse	Yoho
Goodlatte	Noem	Young (AK)
Gosar	Nunes	Young (IA)
Gowdy	Olson	Young (IN)
Granger	Palazzo	Zeldin
Graves (GA)	Palmer	Zinke
Graves (LA)	Paulsen	

NOES—171

Aguilar	Boyle, Brendan	Cartwright
Bass	F.	Castor (FL)
Beatty	Brady (PA)	Castro (TX)
Becerra	Brown (FL)	Chu, Judy
Bera	Brownley (CA)	Cicilline
Beyer	Butterfield	Clark (MA)
Bishop (GA)	Capuano	Clay
Blumenauer	Cárdenas	Clyburn
Bonamici	Carney	Cohen
	Carson (IN)	Connolly

Costa	Keating	Pocan
Courtney	Kelly (IL)	Price (NC)
Crowley	Kennedy	Quigley
Cummings	Kildee	Rangel
Davis (CA)	Kilmer	Rice (NY)
Davis, Danny	King (NY)	Richmond
DeGette	Kuster	Roybal-Allard
Delaney	Langevin	Ruiz
DeLauro	Larsen (WA)	Ruppersberger
DelBene	Larson (CT)	Rush
DeSaulnier	Lawrence	Ryan (OH)
Deutch	Lee	Sánchez, Linda
Dingell	Levin	T.
Doggett	Lewis	Sanchez, Loretta
Donovan	Lieu, Ted	Sarbanes
Doyle, Michael	Lipinski	Schakowsky
F.	Loebach	Schiff
Duckworth	Lofgren	Scott (VA)
Edwards	Lowenthal	Scott, David
Ellison	Lowey	Serrano
Engel	Lujan Grisham	Sewell (AL)
Eshoo	(NM)	Sherman
Esty	Lujan, Ben Ray	Sinema
Farr	(NM)	Sires
Fattah	Lynch	Slaughter
Foster	Maloney,	Smith (WA)
Frankel (FL)	Carolyn	Speier
Fudge	Maloney, Sean	Swalwell (CA)
Gabbard	Matsui	Takai
Gallego	McCollum	Takano
Garamendi	McDermott	Thompson (CA)
Graham	McGovern	Thompson (MS)
Grayson	McNerney	Titus
Green, Al	Meeks	Tonko
Grijalva	Meng	Torres
Gutiérrez	Moore	Tsongas
Hahn	Moulton	Van Hollen
Hastings	Murphy (FL)	Vargas
Heck (WA)	Nadler	Veasey
Higgins	Napolitano	Vela
Himes	Neal	Velázquez
Hinojosa	Nolan	Visclosky
Honda	Norcross	Wasserman
Hoyer	O'Rourke	Schultz
Huffman	Pallone	Waters, Maxine
Israel	Pascrell	Watson Coleman
Jeffries	Payne	Welch
Johnson (GA)	Perlmutter	Wilson (FL)
Johnson, E. B.	Peters	Yarmuth
Kaptur	Pingree	

NOT VOTING—11

Adams	Cleaver	Pelosi
Bilirakis	Conyers	Roe (TN)
Capps	Jackson Lee	Stewart
Clarke (NY)	Nugent	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1818

Mr. PITTENGER changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 289, had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MASSIE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 383, noes 43, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 290]

AYES—383

Abraham Dingell King (IA)
 Aderholt Doggett Kinzinger (IL)
 Aguilar Dold Kirkpatrick
 Allen Doyle, Michael Kline
 Amash F. Knight
 Amodi Duckworth Kuster
 Ashford Duffy Labrador
 Babin Duncan (SC) LaMalfa
 Barletta Duncan (TN) Lamborn
 Barr Edwards Lance
 Barton Ellison Larsen (WA)
 Bass Ellmers (NC) Larson (CT)
 Beatty Emmer (MN) Latta
 Becerra Eshoo Levin
 Benishek Esty Lieu, Ted
 Bera Farenthold Lipinski
 Beyer Fincher LoBiondo
 Bilirakis Fitzpatrick Loebsack
 Bishop (GA) Fleischmann Lofgren
 Bishop (MI) Fleming Long
 Bishop (UT) Flores Loudermilk
 Black Forbes Love
 Blackburn Fortenberry Lowenthal
 Blum Foster Lowey
 Blumenauer Foxx Lucas
 Bonamici Frankel (FL) Luetkemeyer
 Bost Franks (AZ) Lujan Grisham
 Boustany Fudge (NM)
 Boyle, Brendan Gabbard Lujan, Ben Ray
 F. Gallego (NM)
 Brady (TX) Garrett Lummis
 Brat Gibbs Lynch
 Bridenstine Gibson Maloney,
 Brooks (AL) Gohmert Carolyn
 Brooks (IN) Goodlatte Maloney, Sean
 Brown (FL) Gosar Marchant
 Brownley (CA) Gowdy Marino
 Buchanan Graham Massie
 Buck Granger Matsui
 Bucshon Graves (GA) McCarthy
 Burgess Graves (LA) McCaul
 Bustos Graves (MO) McClintock
 Butterfield Grayson McCollum
 Byrne Green, Al McDermott
 Calvert Green, Gene McGovern
 Capps Griffith McHenry
 Capuano Grijalva McKinley
 Cárdenas Grothman McMorris
 Carney Guinta Rodgers
 Carter (GA) Guthrie McNerney
 Carter (TX) Gutiérrez McSally
 Cartwright Hahn Meadows
 Castro (TX) Hanna Meehan
 Chabot Hardy Meng
 Chaffetz Harris Messer
 Chu, Judy Mica
 Cicilline Hastings Miller (FL)
 Clark (MA) Heck (NV) Miller (MI)
 Clawson (FL) Heck (WA) Moolenaar
 Cleaver Hensarling Mooney (WV)
 Clyburn Herrera Beutler Moore
 Coffman Hice, Jody B. Mullin
 Cohen Higgins Mulvaney
 Cole Hill Murphy (FL)
 Collins (GA) Himes Murphy (PA)
 Collins (NY) Hinojosa Nadler
 Comstock Holding Napolitano
 Conaway Honda Neal
 Connolly Hoyer Neugebauer
 Conyers Hudson Newhouse
 Cook Huelskamp Noem
 Costa Huffman Nolan
 Costello (PA) Huizenga (MI) Norcross
 Courtney Hultgren Nunes
 Cramer Hunter O'Rourke
 Crawford Hurd (TX) Olson
 Crenshaw Hurt (VA) Palazzo
 Crowley Israel Pallone
 Cuellar Issa Palmer
 Culberson Jeffries Paulsen
 Cummings Jenkins (KS) Pearce
 Curbelo (FL) Jenkins (WV) Perlmutter
 Davis (CA) Johnson (GA) Perry
 Davis, Danny Johnson (OH) Peters
 Davis, Rodney Johnson, E. B. Peterson
 DeFazio Johnson, Sam Pingree
 DeGette Jolly Pittenger
 DeLauro Jones Pitts
 DelBene Jordan Pocan
 Denham Joyce Poe (TX)
 Dent Kaptur Poliquin
 DeSantis Katko Polis
 DeSaulnier Kelly (IL) Pompeo
 DesJarlais Kelly (PA) Posey
 Deutch Kildee Price, Tom
 Diaz-Balart Kilmer Rangel

Ratcliffe Scott, Austin
 Reed Scott, David
 Reichert Sensenbrenner
 Renacci Serrano
 Ribble Sessions
 Rice (SC) Shimkus
 Rigell Shuster
 Roby Simpson
 Rogers (AL) Sinema
 Rogers (KY) Slaughter
 Rohrabacher Smith (MO)
 Rokita Smith (NE)
 Rooney (FL) Smith (NJ)
 Ros-Lehtinen Smith (TX)
 Roskam Smith (WA)
 Ross Speier
 Rothfus Stefanik
 Rouzer Stivers
 Roybal-Allard Stutzman
 Royce Swalwell (CA)
 Ruiz Takai
 Ruppertsberger Thompson (PA)
 Rush Thornberry
 Russell Tiberi
 Ryan (OH) Tipton
 Ryan (WI) Titus
 Salmon Tonko
 Sanchez, Loretta Torres
 Sanford Trott
 Sarbanes Tsongas
 Scalise Turner
 Schrader Upton
 Schweikert Valadao
 Scott (VA) Van Hollen

NOES—43

Brady (PA) Kennedy
 Carson (IN) Kind
 Castor (FL) King (NY)
 Clarke (NY) Langevin
 Clay Lawrence
 Cooper Lee
 Delaney Lewis
 Donovan MacArthur
 Engel Meeks
 Farr Moulton
 Fattah Pascrell
 Frelinghuysen Payne
 Garamendi Price (NC)
 Harper Quigley
 Keating Rice (NY)

NOT VOTING—6

Adams Nugent
 Jackson Lee Pelosi Roe (TN)
 Stewart

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
 There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1825

Ms. BROWN of Florida, Messrs. CLYBURN, SWALWELL of California, BUTTERFIELD, LOEBSACK, CÁRDENAS, RUSH, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Messrs. GUTIERREZ, and HINOJOSA changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

Mr. LANGEVIN changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair announces to all Members that 2-minute voting will be strictly enforced.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLORES

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 236, noes 190, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 291]

AYES—236

Abraham	Graves (MO)	Paulsen
Aderholt	Griffith	Pearce
Allen	Grothman	Perry
Amash	Guthrie	Pittenger
Amodi	Hanna	Pitts
Babin	Hardy	Poe (TX)
Barletta	Harper	Poliquin
Barr	Harris	Pompeo
Barton	Hartzler	Posey
Benishek	Heck (NV)	Price, Tom
Bilirakis	Hensarling	Ratcliffe
Bishop (MI)	Herrera Beutler	Reed
Bishop (UT)	Hice, Jody B.	Reichert
Black	Hill	Renacci
Blackburn	Holding	Ribble
Blum	Hudson	Rice (SC)
Bost	Huelskamp	Rigell
Boustany	Huizenga (MI)	Roby
Brady (TX)	Hultgren	Rogers (AL)
Brat	Hunter	Rogers (KY)
Bridenstine	Hurd (TX)	Rohrabacher
Brooks (AL)	Hurt (VA)	Rokita
Brooks (IN)	Issa	Rooney (FL)
Buchanan	Jenkins (KS)	Ros-Lehtinen
Buck	Jenkins (WV)	Roskam
Bucshon	Johnson (OH)	Ross
Burgess	Johnson, Sam	Rothfus
Byrne	Jolly	Rouzer
Calvert	Jones	Royce
Carter (GA)	Jordan	Russell
Carter (TX)	Joyce	Ryan (WI)
Chabot	Katko	Salmon
Chaffetz	Kelly (PA)	Sanford
Clawson (FL)	King (IA)	Scalise
Coffman	Kinzinger (IL)	Schweikert
Cole	Kline	Scott, Austin
Collins (GA)	Knight	Sensenbrenner
Collins (NY)	Labrador	Sessions
Comstock	LaMalfa	Shimkus
Conaway	Lamborn	Shuster
Cook	Lance	Simpson
Costello (PA)	Latta	Smith (MO)
Cramer	LoBiondo	Smith (NE)
Crawford	Long	Smith (NJ)
Crenshaw	Loudermilk	Smith (TX)
Cuellar	Love	Stivers
Culberson	Lucas	Stutzman
Curbelo (FL)	Luetkemeyer	Thompson (PA)
Davis, Rodney	Lummis	Thornberry
Denham	MacArthur	Tiberi
Dent	Marchant	Tipton
DeSantis	Marino	Trott
DesJarlais	Massie	Turner
Diaz-Balart	McCarthy	Upton
Duffy	McCaul	Valadao
Duncan (SC)	McClintock	Vela
Duncan (TN)	McHenry	Wagner
Ellmers (NC)	McKinley	Walberg
Emmer (MN)	McMorris	Walden
Farenthold	Rodgers	Walker
Fincher	McSally	Walorski
Fleischmann	Meadows	Walters, Mimi
Fleming	Meehan	Weber (TX)
Flores	Messer	Webster (FL)
Forbes	Mica	Wenstrup
Fortenberry	Miller (FL)	Westerman
Foxx	Miller (MI)	Westmoreland
Franks (AZ)	Moolenaar	Whitfield
Frelinghuysen	Mooney (WV)	Williams
Garrett	Mullin	Wilson (SC)
Gibbs	Mulvaney	Wittman
Gibson	Murphy (PA)	Womack
Gohmert	Neugebauer	Woodall
Goodlatte	Newhouse	Yoder
Gosar	Noem	Yoho
Gowdy	Nunes	Young (AK)
Granger	Olson	Young (IA)
Graves (GA)	Palazzo	Young (IN)
Graves (LA)	Palmer	Zinke

NOES—190

Aguilar	Beatty	Beyer
Ashford	Becerra	Bishop (GA)
Bass	Bera	Blumenauer

Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson

Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Guinta
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Krug
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebbeck
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan

Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascarella
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Buchanan
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Womack
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—6

Adams
Jackson Lee

Nugent
Pelosi

Roe (TN)
Stewart

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1828

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SANFORD

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from South Carolina (Mr.
SANFORD) on which further proceedings
were postponed and on which the ayes
prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 134, noes 290,
not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 292]

AYES—134

Allen
Amash
Babin
Barton
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Buchanan
Buck
Burgess
Byrne
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Cook
Cramer
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Farenthold
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Franks (AZ)
Garrett
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)

Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Harris
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
King (IA)
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lummis
Marchant
Massie
McCauley
McClintock
McHenry
Medows
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Olson

Palmer
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Schalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Stutzman
Tiberi
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walker
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Woodall
Yoho
Young (IN)
Zinke

NOES—290

Abraham
Aderholt
Aguilar
Amodei
Ashford
Barletta
Barr
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishke
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah

Cole
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cubison
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
Denham
Dent
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah

Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibbs
Gibson
Graham
Granger
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Guinta
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Hartzer
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko

Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebbeck
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton

Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nunes
O'Rourke
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascarella
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David

Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Westmoreland
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Womack
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—8

Adams
Bera
Jackson Lee

Johnson (GA)
Nugent
Pelosi

Roe (TN)
Stewart

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1831

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) on
which further proceedings were post-
poned and on which the ayes prevailed
by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 222, noes 204,
not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 293]

AYES—222

Abraham Griffith
Aderholt Grothman
Allen Guinta
Amash Guthrie
Amodei Posey
Babin Harper
Barletta Harris
Barr Hartzler
Barton Hensarling
Benishek Herrera Beutler
Bilirakis Hice, Jody B.
Bishop (MI) Hill
Bishop (UT) Holding
Black Hudson
Blackburn Huelskamp
Blum Huizenga (MI)
Bost Hultgren
Boustany Hunter
Brady (TX) Hurd (TX)
Brat Hurt (VA)
Bridenstine Issa
Brooks (AL) Jenkins (KS)
Brooks (IN) Jenkins (WV)
Buchanan Johnson, Sam
Buck Jones
Bucshon Jordan
Burgess Joyce
Byrne Kelly (PA)
Calvert King (IA)
Carter (GA) Kinzinger (IL)
Carter (TX) Kline
Chabot Knight
Chaffetz Labrador
Clawson (FL) LaMalfa
Cole Lamborn
Collins (GA) Lance
Collins (NY) Latta
Comstock LoBiondo
Conaway Long
Cook Loudermilk
Costello (PA) Love
Cramer Lucas
Crawford Luetkemeyer
Crenshaw Lummis
Culberson Marchant
Davis, Rodney Marino
Dent Massie
DeSantis McCarthy
DesJarlais McCaul
Duffy McClintock
Duncan (SC) McHenry
Duncan (TN) McKinley
Ellmers (NC) McMorris
Emmer (MN) Rodgers
Farenthold Meadows
Fincher Meehan
Fitzpatrick Messer
Fleischmann Mica
Fleming Miller (FL)
Flores Miller (MI)
Forbes Moolenaar
Fortenberry Mooney (WV)
Foxy Mullin
Franks (AZ) Mulvaney
Frelinghuysen Murphy (PA)
Garrett Neugebauer
Gibbs Newhouse
Gohmert Noem
Goodlatte Olson
Gosar Palazzo
Gowdy Palmer
Granger Paulsen
Graves (GA) Pearce
Graves (LA) Perry
Graves (MO) Pittenger

NOES—204

Aguilar Cárdenas
Ashford Carney
Bass Carson (IN)
Beatty Cartwright
Becerra Castor (FL)
Bera Castro (TX)
Beyer Chu, Judy
Bishop (GA) Cicilline
Blumenauer Clark (MA)
Bonamici Clarke (NY)
Boyle, Brendan Clay
F, Cleaver
Brady (PA) Clyburn
Brown (FL) Coffman
Brownley (CA) Cohen
Bustos Connolly
Butterfield Conyers
Capps Cooper
Capuano Costa

Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Robby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallo
Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster

Adams
Jackson Lee

Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Loftgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Serrano
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
McSally
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
Nunes
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pallone
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel

NOT VOTING—6

Nugent
Pelosi
Roe (TN)
Stewart

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1835

So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) on
which further proceedings were post-
poned and on which the ayes prevailed
by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 227, noes 198,
not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 294]

AYES—227

Abraham
Aderholt

Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin

Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis, Rodney
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)

Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry

NOES—198

Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright

Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster

Frankel (FL)	Lofgren	Ruiz	Bridenstine	Hill	Pompeo	Graham	Lowey	Rush
Fudge	Lowenthal	Ruppersberger	Brooks (AL)	Holding	Posey	Grayson	Lujan Grisham	Ryan (OH)
Gabbard	Lowey	Rush	Brooks (IN)	Hudson	Price, Tom	Green, Al	(NM)	Sánchez, Linda
Gallo	Lujan Grisham	Ryan (OH)	Buchanan	Huelskamp	Ratcliffe	Green, Gene	Luján, Ben Ray	T.
Garamendi	(NM)	Sánchez, Linda	Buck	Huizenga (MI)	Reed	Grijalva	(NM)	Sanchez, Loretta
Graham	Luján, Ben Ray	T.	Bucshon	Hultgren	Reichert	Gutiérrez	Lynch	Sarbanes
Grayson	(NM)	Sanchez, Loretta	Burgess	Hunter	Renacci	Hahn	Maloney,	Schakowsky
Green, Al	Lynch	Sarbanes	Byrne	Hurd (TX)	Ribble	Hanna	Carolyn	Schiff
Green, Gene	MacArthur	Schakowsky	Calvert	Hurt (VA)	Rice (SC)	Hastings	Maloney, Sean	Scott (VA)
Grijalva	Maloney,	Schiff	Carter (GA)	Issa	Rigell	Heck (WA)	Matsui	Scott, David
Gutiérrez	Carolyn	Schrader	Carter (TX)	Jenkins (KS)	Roby	Higgins	McCollum	Serrano
Hahn	Maloney, Sean	Scott (VA)	Chabot	Jenkins (WV)	Rogers (AL)	Himes	McDermott	Sewell (AL)
Hardy	Matsui	Scott, David	Chaffetz	Johnson (OH)	Rogers (KY)	Hinojosa	McGovern	Sherman
Hastings	McCollum	Serrano	Clawson (FL)	Johnson, Sam	Rohrabacher	Honda	McNerney	Sinema
Heck (NV)	McDermott	Sewell (AL)	Coffman	Jolly	Rokita	Hoyer	Meeks	Sires
Heck (WA)	McGovern	Sherman	Cole	Jones	Rooney (FL)	Huffman	Meng	Slaughter
Higgins	McNerney	Sinema	Collins (GA)	Jordan	Ros-Lehtinen	Israel	Moore	Smith (WA)
Himes	McSally	Sires	Collins (NY)	Joyce	Roskam	Jeffries	Moulton	Speier
Hinojosa	Meeks	Slaughter	Comstock	Katko	Ross	Johnson (GA)	Murphy (FL)	Swalwell (CA)
Honda	Meng	Smith (WA)	Conaway	Kelly (PA)	Rothfus	Johnson, E. B.	Nadler	Takai
Hoyer	Moore	Speier	Cook	King (IA)	Rouzer	Kaptur	Napolitano	Thompson (CA)
Huffman	Moulton	Swalwell (CA)	Cuellar	King (NY)	Royce	Keating	Neal	Thompson (MS)
Israel	Murphy (FL)	Takai	Costello (PA)	Kinzing (IL)	Russell	Kelly (IL)	Nolan	Titus
Jeffries	Nadler	Takano	Cramer	Kline	Ryan (WI)	Kennedy	Norcross	Torres
Johnson (GA)	Napolitano	Thompson (CA)	Crawford	Knight	Salmon	Kildee	O'Rourke	Tsongas
Johnson, E. B.	Neal	Thompson (MS)	Crenshaw	Labrador	Sanford	Kilmer	Pallone	Van Hollen
Kaptur	Nolan	Titus	Cuellar	LaMalfa	Scalise	Kind	Pascrell	Vargas
Keating	Norcross	Tonko	Culberson	Lamborn	Schrader	Kirkpatrick	Payne	Veasey
Kelly (IL)	O'Rourke	Torres	Lance	Curbelo (FL)	Schweikert	Kuster	Perlmutter	Vela
Kennedy	Pallone	Tsongas	Davis, Rodney	Latta	Scott, Austin	Langevin	Peters	Velázquez
Kildee	Pascrell	Valadao	Denham	LoBiondo	Sensenbrenner	Larsen (WA)	Pingree	Visclosky
Kilmer	Payne	Van Hollen	Dent	Long	Sessions	Larson (CT)	Pocan	Walz
Kind	Perlmutter	Vargas	DeSantis	Loudermilk	Shimkus	Lawrence	Polis	Wasserman
King (NY)	Peters	Veasey	DesJarlais	Love	Shuster	Lee	Price (NC)	Schultz
Kirkpatrick	Peterson	Velázquez	Diaz-Balart	Lucas	Simpson	Levin	Quigley	Waters, Maxine
Kuster	Pingree	Visclosky	Dold	Luetkemeyer	Smith (MO)	Lewis	Rangel	Watson Coleman
Langevin	Pocan	Walz	Donovan	Lummis	Smith (NE)	Lieu, Ted	Rice (NY)	Welch
Larsen (WA)	Polis	Wasserman	Duffy	MacArthur	Smith (NJ)	Lipinski	Richmond	Wilson (FL)
Larson (CT)	Price (NC)	Schultz	Duncan (SC)	Marchant	Smith (TX)	Loeb sack	Roybal-Allard	Yarmuth
Lawrence	Quigley	Waters, Maxine	Duncan (TN)	Marino	Stefanik	Lofgren	Ruiz	
Lee	Rangel	Watson Coleman	Ellmers (NC)	Massie	Stivers	Lowenthal	Ruppersberger	
Levin	Reichert	Welch	Emmer (MN)	McCarthy	Stutzman			
Lewis	Rice (NY)	Wilson (FL)	Farenthold	McCauley	Takano			
Lieu, Ted	Richmond	Yarmuth	Fincher	McClintock	Thompson (PA)			
Lipinski	Ros-Lehtinen		Fleischmann	McHenry	Thornberry			
Loeb sack	Roybal-Allard		Fleming	McKinley	Tiberi			
			Flores	McMorris	Tipton			
			Forbes	Rodgers	Trott			
			Fortenberry	McSally	Turner			
			Fox	Meadows	Upton			
			Franks (AZ)	Meehan	Valadao			
			Frelinghuysen	Messer	Wagner			
			Garrett	Mica	Walberg			
			Gibbs	Miller (FL)	Walden			
			Gibson	Miller (MI)	Walker			
			Gohmert	Moolenaar	Walorski			
			Goodlatte	Mooney (WV)	Walters, Mimi			
			Gosar	Mullin	Weber (TX)			
			Gowdy	Mulvaney	Webster (FL)			
			Granger	Murphy (PA)	Wenstrup			
			Graves (GA)	Neugebauer	Westerman			
			Graves (LA)	Newhouse	Westmoreland			
			Graves (MO)	Noem	Whitfield			
			Griffith	Nunes	Williams			
			Grothman	Olson	Wilson (SC)			
			Guinta	Palazzo	Wittman			
			Guthrie	Palmer	Womack			
			Hardy	Paulsen	Woodall			
			Harper	Pearce	Yoder			
			Harris	Perry	Yoho			
			Hartzler	Peterson	Young (AK)			
			Heck (NV)	Pittenger	Young (IA)			
			Hensarling	Pitts	Young (IN)			
			Herrera Beutler	Poe (TX)	Zeldin			
			Hice, Jody B.	Poliquin	Zinke			

NOT VOTING—7

Adams	Pelosi	Vela
Jackson Lee	Roe (TN)	
Nugent	Stewart	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1838

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DENHAM

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 245, noes 181, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 295]

AYES—245

Abraham	Barletta	Black
Aderholt	Barr	Blackburn
Allen	Barton	Blum
Amash	Benishke	Bost
Amodei	Bilirakis	Boustany
Ashford	Bishop (MI)	Brady (TX)
Babin	Bishop (UT)	Brat

Aguilar	Castro (FL)
Bass	Castro (TX)
Beatty	Chu, Judy
Becerra	Cicilline
Bera	Clark (MA)
Beyer	Clarke (NY)
Bishop (GA)	Clay
Blumenauer	Cleaver
Bonamici	Clyburn
Boyle, Brendan F.	Cohen
Brady (PA)	Connolly
Brown (FL)	Conyers
Brownley (CA)	Cooper
Bustos	Courtney
Butterfield	Crowley
Capps	Cummings
Capuano	Davis (CA)
Cárdenas	Davis, Danny
Carney	DeFazio
Carson (IN)	DeGette
Cartwright	Delaney
	DeLauro

NOES—181

Castor (FL)	DelBene
Castro (TX)	DeSaulnier
Chu, Judy	Deutch
Cicilline	Dingell
Clark (MA)	Doggett
Clarke (NY)	Doyle, Michael F.
Clay	Duckworth
Cleaver	Edwards
Clyburn	Ellison
Cohen	Engel
Connolly	Eshoo
Conyers	Esty
Cooper	Farr
Courtney	Fattah
Crowley	Fitzpatrick
Cummings	Foster
Davis (CA)	Frankel (FL)
Davis, Danny	Fudge
DeFazio	Gabbard
DeGette	Galleo
Delaney	Garamendi
DeLauro	

NOT VOTING—6

Adams	Nugent	Roe (TN)
Jackson Lee	Pelosi	Stewart

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1841

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the “Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2016”.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. REED) having assumed the chair, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2578) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. I am in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Brownley of California moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2578 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 23, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$6,000,000)”.

In the “Violence Against Women Prevention and Prosecution Programs” account, on page 38, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$3,000,000)”.

In the “Violence Against Women Prevention and Prosecution Programs” account, on page 39, line 22, after the dollar amount relating to sexual assault victims assistance, insert “(increased by \$3,000,000)”.

In the “Juvenile Justice Programs” account, on page 47, line 10, after the dollar amount relating to missing and exploited children programs, insert “(increased by \$3,000,000)”.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to H.R. 2578, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

My amendment would provide an additional \$3 million for Violence Against Women prevention and prosecution programs, increasing resources for sexual assault victims’ assistance. My amendment would also provide an additional \$3 million for Juvenile Justice programs, directed to the Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force program.

Mr. Speaker, there is more than ample room within the budget cap for this bill to do more to help sexual assault victims and prevent the exploitation of children. I hope we can all agree that these critical programs are worthy of added resources.

The Sexual Assault Services Program was authorized through the Violence Against Women Act and was the first

Federal program dedicated to the provision of direct services to victims of sexual violence.

Across the country, the Sexual Assault Services Program supports critical, lifesaving, safety net services. Support services are offered to both adult and minor survivors of sexual assault and to family members who are helping them cope with the mental health issues and physical trauma of sexual assault.

The program also funds intervention and advocacy services, providing survivors with the help that they need to navigate through the medical and criminal justice systems.

For many survivors of sexual assault, this program is a critical and necessary source of support at the most vulnerable time in their lives. We must support these lifesaving programs and stand up for survivors of sexual assault.

Additionally, we must do more to protect vulnerable children from predators who despicably exploit children on the Internet. That is why my amendment will provide a much-needed increase for the Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force program, which funds State and local law enforcement who investigate online child exploitation.

The program also provides forensic, prevention, and investigative assistance to law enforcement, educators, prosecutors, and families. The program also ensures law enforcement officers are trained to deal with online child pornography and child enticement so that these cases will be fully investigated and prosecuted.

In 2014 alone, 7,800 individuals were arrested, and the task forces around the country conducted over 60,000 forensic investigations. Clearly there is an urgent and compelling moral need to address these heinous crimes.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on the motion to recommit, to vote “yes” to protect women and girls from sexual assault and violence, to vote “yes” to protect children from online predators.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ), my friend who is a champion in protecting children.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the gentlewoman’s motion to recommit because there are children out there who need to be saved. They are waiting to be saved.

This motion provides additional funding for the Internet Crimes Against Children program, a national network of 61 coordinated law enforcement task forces investigating and prosecuting those who sexually exploit our most vulnerable constituents, our children.

With the proliferation of the Internet and wireless technology, online child pornography has become an epidemic. And let’s not forget that these are not just heinous images. They are crime

scene photos. The ICAC needs resources to go after these criminals now.

According to estimates, half of these arrests lead us to the door of a hands-on offender, and that is a child waiting to be rescued. Yet in one recent year, the ICAC only had the resources to investigate a mere 2 percent of all leads.

Previous increases in Federal funding have directly resulted in thousands more arrests, contributing to many more thousands of children who are outright rescued or who will be spared contact with an abuser.

Let’s take this opportunity to help the ICAC rescue more children. Please, think about these precious babies being victimized. Let’s rescue as many of them as possible. If you are a parent, God forbid it was your own child.

I urge Members’ support for the motion to recommit, and I thank the gentlewoman for her commitment to making sure that we can rescue America’s victimized children.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, before I begin—and I will be very brief—I want to make sure to thank the majority staff who have worked so hard on this bill. I want to thank our chief clerk, John Martens; Leslie Albright; Jeff Ashford; Taylor Kelly; Colin Samples; and Ashley Schiller for their tireless work drafting this bill, along with Bob Bonner and Matt Smith on the minority’s staff and Corey Inglee and Megan Olmstead in my personal office. And a personal thank you to my good friend, the Congressman from Philadelphia, who has done such a great job. We have worked together arm in arm on this bill.

Starting at about 2 o’clock yesterday afternoon, we have worked through over 80 amendments. All the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BROWNLEY) would have had to do was to show up here. During the course of that debate, any Member could have offered an amendment, and that is one of the great things about this process.

I want to thank our majority leader and our Speaker, Mr. BOEHNER, for opening up the legislative process. Unlike in the past, any Member of this Congress could stand up and represent their 700,000 constituents. You could take a Big Chief notepad and a pencil and just write out an amendment and walk right down there and give it to the Clerk.

All the gentlewoman from California had to do was just write the amendment up and present it to the Clerk. Why, we would have even accepted it. But instead, she offers it up here today as a procedural trick to confuse and confound.

We produced a great bill. The ranking member and I have worked together arm in arm to produce a good

Abraham	Cramer	Guthrie
Aderholt	Crawford	Hanna
Allen	Crenshaw	Hardy
Amodei	Cuellar	Harper
Ashford	Culberson	Harris
Babin	Curbelo (FL)	Hartzler
Barletta	Davis, Rodney	Heck (NV)
Barr	Denham	Hensarling
Barton	Dent	Herrera Beutler
Benishek	DeSantis	Hice, Jody B.
Bilirakis	DesJarlais	Hill
Bishop (MI)	Diaz-Balart	Holding
Bishop (UT)	Dold	Hudson
Black	Donovan	Huelskamp
Blackburn	Duffy	Huizenga (MI)
Blum	Duncan (SC)	Hultgren
Bost	Ellmers (NC)	Hunter
Boustany	Emmer (MN)	Hurd (TX)
Brady (TX)	Farenthold	Hurt (VA)
Brat	Fincher	Issa
Bridenstine	Fitzpatrick	Jenkins (KS)
Brooks (AL)	Fleischmann	Jenkins (WV)
Brooks (IN)	Flores	Johnson (OH)
Brownley (CA)	Forbes	Johnson, Sam
Buchanan	Fortenberry	Jolly
Bucshon	Foxo	Jordan
Burgess	Frelinghuysen	Joyce
Bustos	Garrett	Katko
Byrne	Gibbs	Kelly (PA)
Calvert	Gibson	King (IA)
Carter (GA)	Gohmert	King (NY)
Carter (TX)	Goodlatte	Kinzinger (IL)
Chabot	Gosar	Kline
Chaffetz	Gowdy	Knight
Clawson (FL)	Graham	Kuster
Coffman	Granger	Labadador
Cole	Graves (GA)	LaMalfa
Collins (GA)	Graves (LA)	Lamborn
Collins (NY)	Graves (MO)	Lance
Conaway	Green, Gene	Latta
Cook	Griffith	LoBiondo
Costa	Grothman	Long
Costello (PA)	Guinta	Loudermilk

Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry

NAYS—183

Aguilar
Amash
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Buck
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr

Peterson
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratchliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)

Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stivers
Stutzman
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Viscosky

Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman

Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—7

Adams
Comstock
Jackson Lee
Keating
Nugent
Roe (TN)
Stewart

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DOLD) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1905

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed the last two votes in this evening's series. Had I been present I would have voted as follows: 1) Democrat Motion to Recommit—"no," 2) Passage of H.R. 2578—FY16 Commerce, Justice, Science Appropriations Act—"yes."

TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill, H.R. 3577, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 287 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2577.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1908

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2577) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, with Mr. BISHOP of Utah in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to present to the House today for consideration H.R. 2577, the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2016.

The committee has put forth a bill that conforms to our 302(b) allocation of \$55.3 billion in budget authority and is in line with the budget cap of 1.016, "ten sixteen."

Under such an allocation, we prioritized programs and spending to achieve, really, three very important basic goals: first, we continue the oblim funding levels of MAP-21 contingent upon reauthorization; we keep the commercial airspace running smoothly; and also we preserve the housing option for all current HUD-assisted families.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is a balanced bill with the allocation that has been given to us by the chairman. The Department of Transportation is funded at \$17.2 billion in budget authority and \$70.6 billion in total budgetary resources to ensure, Mr. Chairman, the safe and effective transportation of goods and people in America.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development is funded at \$42 billion to provide housing opportunities and assistance to the most vulnerable in both cities and rural areas across our great Nation.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, we are a diverse body and this is a very diverse bill, and I know some Members will speak for increased funding. I would like to remind my colleagues that if you are going to be voting against this bill, you are voting against the commercial airspace system and our air traffic controllers and control system; against housing programs for the most vulnerable, including the elderly and families; and frankly, you would also be voting against community development block grants that are vital to the cities and counties that we all represent.

Some, however, Mr. Chairman, will speak for lower spending. Here it is also important to remember that the House passed a budget resolution, which this bill adheres to, Mr. Chairman, and the Congress and the President are currently bound by the Budget Control Act, which does include sequester. So this bill takes the responsible steps of setting funding priorities for the next fiscal year, many of which are shared, frankly, between both parties, and again, very important, without doing it with across-the-board cuts or across-the-board sequester.

The whole House of Representatives now has the opportunity for full consideration of this legislation. It is imperative that we move this bill to final passage reflecting the amendments obviously adopted by the House, and we move this bill to conference in time for the new fiscal year.

I really need to first thank my friend, the gentleman from North Carolina and the ranking member of this